

4224 add
AN H U M B L E
A T T E M P T
T O
I N V E S T I G A T E A N D D E F E N D
T H E
S C R I P T U R E - D O C T R I N E

C O N C E R N I N G

The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit :

THE METHOD NEW, BUT PLAIN AND EASY
TO BE UNDERSTOOD.

W I T H

An A P P E N D I X :

In which such Objections as are commonly urged by
some, against some Things here advanced, from
the HEBREW Names, אֱלֹהִים, *Aleim*, and יְהוָה,
Jeue, &c. are more particularly considered, and the
Imports or Significations of these Names pointed
out.

By Φίλος Αληθείας, A Friend to Truth.

Ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀληθὴς ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκωσι σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν
Θεόν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

*And this is the eternal life, that they may know thee the
only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*

JOHN xvii. 3.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

M,DCC,LXXX.



READER,

THE subject treated of in the following pages, is surely of very great importance, as it relates to the supreme Object of worship; who expressly requires those that worship him, not only to worship him in spirit, but also in truth. And since it is the duty of all, to be daily exercised in the worship of God; a fixed and just or scriptural idea of this glorious Object of worship, who can only be approached through his only begotten Son, by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, is surely highly necessary to prevent us from entertaining false or unscriptural ideas of that inconceivably glorious One. The importance of this is clearly intimated to us in these words of our Lord's solemn address to his heavenly Father: *This is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* There is too much ground to fear, that what our Lord said to the woman of Samaria is too applicable to many worshippers; *Ye worship ye know not what.* For it is a melancholy truth, that the clearest doctrines revealed in Scripture, may be obscured, and even rendered unintelligible, by the perverse reasonings of men.

The following pages are intended to represent the sublime and important doctrine of the Trinity, as expressed in the words of inspiration; and it is hoped, that if this scriptural representation is duly attended to, it will lead to more clear and consistent ideas of the **ONLY TRUE GOD, and JESUS CHRIST WHOM HE HATH SENT**; than can be expected from that *mystical* mode of explanation, that hath been transmitted to the protestant churches
by

by *Mystery Babylon*. But as this doctrine has not been suffered to appear in its native simple dress, since the Man of sin ascended his throne, which is now many generations past ; it is likely to appear odd in the eyes of those who judge more from custom than the real nature of things : It is therefore requested, that the whole be read with attention, and compared with the sacred text ; and whatever agrees not with that rule of righteousness, let it be rejected ; but if what is said, agrees with the sayings of the Prophets and Apostles, let every one take heed how they censure, lest in condemning thereof they condemn the words of the MOST HIGH. No pretensions are here made to infallibility ; but an appeal may be made to the Searcher of hearts, that an infallible rule has been sincerely observed.

That what is here offered to the public, may, through the effectual working of the Holy Spirit, be a means of increasing the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and of God the Father through him ; and that grace, mercy and truth may be multiplied thereby, and joy and peace may be increased through the belief of the truth as it is in Jesus, is the desire of

The **AUTHOR.**

AN HUMBLE ATTEMPT, &c.

THERE appears to be no doctrine of greater consequence, than that which concerns the knowledge of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; nor is there any thing more clearly revealed than what is necessary to be believed concerning this sublime and important doctrine. And yet no doctrine has been rendered more obscure and unintelligible, than this has been, by the modes in which some have attempted to explain it. It will always fare with those who attempt to amend what God hath revealed, either by adding or diminishing, as with those spoken of Rom. i. 22. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

Since all our knowledge of this sublime and important doctrine, must be drawn from the word of God, the shortest and most certain way to attain the true knowledge thereof, will be to take a view of what the Scriptures of truth say, concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, distinctly considered; and then to form our sentiments accordingly.

For this purpose, and to illustrate and confirm what shall appear to be the Scripture-doctrine; what is here intended may be divided into the following heads.

I. An enquiry into the Names, Attributes or Characters that are ascribed to the Father, the

A

Son,

Son, and the Holy Spirit, as properly and exclusively belonging to each, distinctly considered.

II. An enquiry into the works that are thus exclusively ascribed to each, in Scripture.

III. An enquiry into the inferences that appear most native, from what the Scripture reveal concerning the foregoing particulars.

IV. An enquiry into the strength or propriety of the objections that are or may be supposed to be brought against the doctrines inferred.

V. A short summary of the doctrine that is opposed to the foregoing inferences; with an enquiry into the consequences that appear necessarily to flow therefrom.

VI. A short summary of the Scripture-doctrine; with an enquiry into the uses of information, admonition, and comfort, that may be deduced therefrom.

It may be observed in general, as introductory to what follows; that from the inconceivably near, and intimate union, that subsists between the Father and the Son; he being the express image of the Father's person, and brightness of his glory; the Father dwelling in him, and he in the Father; and all the glory and perfections, the counsels and agency of the Father being manifested through the Son; from thence it follows, that whatever relations the Father sustains to any of his creatures, it is through his only begotten Son, that he sustains these relations. And hence we find, that names expressive of relation to creatures, are in Scripture applied in common to the

the Father and the Son. A right understanding of these names, will lead us to a discovery of the sovereignty and supremacy, &c. of God the Father and his Son Jesus Christ over us, and of our dependence and subordination, &c. but we cannot from these, discover what relations the Father and the Son bear to each other, or whether the Son is equal or subordinate to the Father. This must be discovered from such names as express relation to one another; and are applied to one, in a sense in which it cannot be, (at least is not in Scripture) applied to any other; and from such agency being ascribed to one, as cannot be, (at least is not in Scripture) ascribed to any other. It is the Scripture account of these that is the subject of the following enquiries.

H E A D I.

An enquiry into the Names, Attributes and Characters that are in Scripture, properly and exclusively ascribed to the FATHER, to the SON, and to the HOLY SPIRIT, distinctly considered.

S E C T. I.

Of the Names, &c. that are thus ascribed to the Father.

1. HE is called the Most High God, Gen. xiv. 18, 20, 22. Psal. lvii. 2. Dan. iii. 26. and v. 18. Luke viii. 28.

2. He is called the invisible God, Col. i. 15. Of him it is said, John vi. 46. "Not that any

A 2

"bath

“ hath seen the Father, except he who is from
“ God.” And John i. 18. “ No one hath
“ seen God at any time.”

3. Goodness is attributed to him in some
peculiar and exclusive manner, Matth. xix. 17.
—“ There is none good but one,” that is
God. Gr. “ no one is good except one God.”

4. The character of Father is peculiarly
ascribed to him, 1 Cor. viii. 6.—“ There is
“ one God the Father, of whom are all
“ things ; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by
“ whom are all things.” Eph. iv. 6. “ One
“ God and Father of all, who is above all,
“ and in you all.”

5. He is exclusively called the Father of our
Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. i. 3. “ Blessed be
“ God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus
“ Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God
“ of all comfort.”

6. He is called the God as well as the Fa-
ther of our Lord Jesus Christ, Eph. i. 3. “ Blef-
“ sed be the God and Father of our Lord
“ Jesus Christ.” See also 1 Pet. i. 3.

7. He is called the Head of Christ, 1 Cor.
xi. 3. “ But I would have you to know, that
“ the head of every man is Christ,—and the
“ head of Christ is God.”

S E C T. II.

*Of the Names, &c. that are assigned to the Son,
as properly and exclusively belonging to him.*

1. He is called the only begotten Son of
God, John iii. 16. “ God so loved the world,
“ that he sent his only begotten Son,” &c.
John i. 14.—“ The only begotten of the Fa-
“ ther.”

2. He

2. He is called his own or proper Son, Rom. viii. 32. "He that spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all."

3. He is called the Image of the invisible God, Col. i. 15. "Who is the image of the invisible God." Heb. i. 3. "Who being the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person."

4. He is called the Beginning, Col. i. 18. "Who is the beginning." Rev. iii. 14. "The beginning of the creation of God." Prov. viii. 22. "JEHOVAH possessed me, the beginning of his ways." So the words are in the original.

5. He is called the first-born, or first begotten of every creature, Col. i. 15. "The first born of every creature." Heb. i. 6.—"When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him."

6. He is called the first born or begotten from the dead, Col. i. 18. "The first born from the dead." Rev. i. 5. "The first begotten from the dead."

7. Mediation is attributed to him in an exclusive manner, 1 Tim. ii. 5. "For there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

S E C T. III.

Of the Names, Attributes and Characters that are properly and exclusively ascribed to the Holy Spirit in Scripture.

UPON enquiry, I do not find that any name, &c. is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, which is not

in some respect ascribed either to the Father or the Son. The name Spirit, is a very common name ; it is applied to the Father, John iv. 23, 24.—“ The Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.” It is applied to the Son, 2 Cor. iii. 17. “ Now the Lord is that Spirit.” And even procession, which is commonly considered as the distinguishing property of the Spirit, is not strictly so in every respect. For procession is ascribed to the Son as well as to the Spirit, John. viii. 42. “ Jesus saith unto them, “ if God were your Father, ye would love me, for I proceeded forth and came from God.” Procession is capable of a very general application, as well as the name Spirit ; it is applied to the words that our Lord spake, Luke iv. 22. “ And all bare him witness, and “ wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth.”

H E A D II.

An enquiry into the Actions or Works, that are in Scripture, properly and exclusively ascribed to the FATHER, to the SON, and to the HOLY SPIRIT, distinctly considered.

S E C T. I.

Of the Actions or Works that are peculiarly and exclusively proper to the Father.

1. THE act of generating or bringing forth the only begotten Son ; this act is intimated by the name Father, and is expressly ascribed to him, who is generally understood by that name,

name, John i. 14.—“ The only begotten of
 “ the Father.” Psal. ii. 7. “ I will declare
 “ the decree ; the Lord hath said to me, thou
 “ art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.”
 Prov. viii. 24, 25. “ When there was no
 “ depths I was brought forth,—before the
 “ mountains were settled ; before the hills
 “ was I brought forth.”

2. The appointment setting up or anointing
 the only begotten Son, to be the executor of
 all his purposes relative to creatures, Prov. viii.
 23 “ I was set up from everlasting.” The word
 rendered *set up*, signifies to pour out, as drink-
 offerings ; or as oil is poured upon the heads
 of persons to anoint them. Hence as a name,
 it signifies persons anointed to office ; for it is
 the word מָשִׁיחַ that is rendered Dukes, Josh.
 xiii. 21. Princes, Ezek. xxxii. 30. Principal
 men, Micah v. 5. Princes, Psal. lxxxiii. 11.
 Princes, Dan. xi. 8. It seems therefore to be
 a word very fit to express the constitution, or
 appointment of the Son of God, to be the
 great Agent, through or by whom, all the per-
 fections and counsels of the Father should be
 manifested in the creation, preservation, and
 government of finite beings : And when it is
 said, *I was set up*, it is plain that this setting up
 or anointing is the Father's act ; for Acts x.
 38. “ God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with
 “ the Holy Spirit, and with power.” And
 Eph. iii. 9. “ God created all things by Jesus
 “ Christ.”

Besides this general appointment, he is ap-
 pointed of the Father to the offices of a Pro-
 phet, a Priest, and a King, for the preserva-
 tion,

tion, government, and restoration of sinners. Which offices are specially manifested in, and exercised over the church in the present dispensation, Acts vii. 37. " This is that Moses
 " who said unto the children of Israel, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto
 " you of your brethren like unto me, him shall ye hear." Psal. cx. 4. " The Lord
 " hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a
 " priest for ever after the order of Melchizedeck." Psal. ii. 6. " Yet have I set my
 " king upon my holy hill of Zion."

3. The merciful and mysterious purpose of gathering all things together in or by Christ. Eph. i. 9, 10. " Having made known unto us
 " the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in
 " himself. That in the dispensation of the fulness of the times, he might gather together into one all things in Christ, both
 " which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in (or by) him."

4. The intimation of this purpose, and the means for accomplishing it to Jesus Christ, Isa. l. 4, 5. " The Lord God hath given me
 " the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to
 " him that is weary; he wakeneth morning by morning; he wakeneth mine ear to hear
 " as the learned. The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back." Psal. xl. 7, 8.—
 " Lo I come,—I delight to do thy will O my God." John viii. 38. " I speak that which I
 " have seen with my Father." John v. 20.
 " The

“ The Father loveth the Son and sheweth him
 “ all things that himself doeth.” Rev. i. 1.

“ The revelation of Jesus Christ which God
 “ gave unto him.”

5. The sending the only begotten Son into
 the world, John iii. 16. “ For God so loved
 “ the world, that he sent his only begotten
 “ Son, that whosoever believeth in him should
 “ not perish, but have everlasting life.” John
 vii. 28, 29.—“ Then cried Jesus,—he that
 “ sent me is true, whom ye know not. But
 “ I know him, for I am from him, and he
 “ hath sent me.” John viii. 26. 28, 29.—He
 “ that sent me is true; and I speak to the
 “ world those things which I have heard of
 “ him.—And I do nothing of myself; but as
 “ the Father hath taught me, I speak these
 “ things. And he that sent me, is with me.”

6. The exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ
 in his incarnate nature, Acts v. 30, 31. “ The
 “ God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom
 “ ye slew and hanged on a tree; him hath
 “ God exalted.” Eph. i. 21. “ Far above all
 “ principality, and power, and might, and
 “ dominion, and every name that is named,
 “ not only in this world, but also in that
 “ which is to come.” See also Philip. ii. 9.
 and Acts ii. 33.

7. The gift of all power unto the Son, and
 the delivering of all things into his hand, Mat.
 xxviii. 18. “ And Jesus came and spake unto
 “ them, Saying, all power is given unto me
 “ in heaven and in earth.” John v. 22, 27.
 “ For the Father judgeth (*υφαινε*) no one, but
 “ hath committed all judgment unto the Son.
 “ ———And

“ ———And given him authority to execute
 “ judgment also, because he is the Son of
 “ man.” Matth. xi. 27. “ All things are de-
 “ livered unto me of my Father. John xiii. 3.
 “ Jesus knowing that the Father had given all
 “ things into his hands, and that he was come
 “ from God and went to God.”

The knowledge of the times and seasons
 seems also to be ascribed in some peculiar man-
 ner to the Father, Acts i. 7. “ And he said
 “ unto them, it is not for you to know the
 “ times and seasons which the Father hath put
 “ in his own power.” Compare Mark xiii. 32.

S E C T. II.

*Of the Actions or Works that are peculiarly and
 exclusively proper to the Son.*

1. THE accepting of the Father’s proposal
 of the covenant of redemption, or undertaking
 the recovery of lost sinners, Psal. xl. 7, 8.
 “ Then said I, Lo, I come in the volume of
 “ the book it is written of me, I delight to
 “ do thy will O my God.” Heb. x. 9, 10.
 “ Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O
 “ God. ———By the which will we are sancti-
 “ fied, through the offering of the body of
 “ Christ once for all.”

2. That of coming into the world to be in-
 carnate, converse with men, undergo a state
 of humiliation and suffering; even unto death,
 Matt. xx. 28. — “ The Son of man came not
 “ to be ministred unto, but to minister, and
 “ to give his life a ransom for many.”

3. The leaving of the world and going a-
 gain unto the Father, to sit on his throne, at
 the

the right hand of the Majesty on high, John xvi. 28. "I am come forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go to the Father."

4. The work of mediation between God and men, 1 Tim. ii. 5. "For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time."

S E C T. III.

Of the Actions or Works that are ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

So far as I can find, there appears to be no action or work peculiarly and exclusively ascribed to the Holy Spirit, in Scripture. The following particulars seem to include all the actions or works that are ascribed to the Spirit, and these are also ascribed either to the Father or the Son, or both.

1. Creation is ascribed to the Spirit, Job xxvi. 13. "By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens." Job xxxiii. 4. "The Spirit of God hath made me." But this is also ascribed to the Father and the Son, Eph. iii. 9. "Who created all things by Jesus Christ."

2. The conception of the body of Christ in the womb of the virgin Mary, is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, Matth. i. 18. "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise. When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Spirit." This is also ascribed to the Father, Heb. x. 5. "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me."

3. The

3. The working of miracles, Rom. xv. 19. "Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God." These also are ascribed to the Father and the Son, Acts ii. 22. "Ye men of Israel hear these words, Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you."

4. The offering of Jesus Christ a sacrifice for sin, is ascribed to the Son and the Spirit, Heb. ix. 14. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God," &c. This is also ascribed to the Father, Isa. liii. 10.—"When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin."

5. The calling and appointing church officers, is ascribed to the Spirit, Acts xiii. 2. "The Holy Spirit said, separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them." Acts xx. 28. "Take heed unto yourselves, and unto all the flock over which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers." This is ascribed to the Son, John xv. 16. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit." Eph. iv. 11. "And he gave (or appointed) some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." This is also ascribed to the Father, Acts x. 41. "Unto witnesses chosen before of God, even us," &c. 1 Cor. xii. 28. "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers," &c.

6. Dwelling

6. Dwelling and abiding in the hearts of believers is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, John xiv. 17. "The Spirit of truth which the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him, but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." This is also ascribed to the Father and the Son, verse 23. "Jesus answered and said unto him, if a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

7. The teaching of believers, and bringing all things to their remembrance, is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, John xiv. 26. "But the Comforter which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance." This is ascribed to the Father, John vi. 45. "It is written in the prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me." Matth. xvi. 17.—"Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." It is ascribed to the Son, Psal. xl. 9, 10. "I have preached righteousness in the great congregation," &c. Heb. ii. 12. "I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing unto thee." It is ascribed both to the Father and the Son, Heb. i. 1. "God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." The

book of Revelation is said to be "the revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants." And at the conclusion of each of the epistles to the seven churches, it is said, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches."

8. Quickening efficacy is ascribed to the Spirit, John vi. 63. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." 2 Cor. iii. 6. "The Spirit giveth life." 1 Pet. iii. 18. "Quickened by the Spirit." This is ascribed to the Father, John v. 21. "The Father quickeneth the dead." 1 Tim. vi. 13. "God who quickeneth all things." See also Rom. iv. 17. and Acts iii. 26. "God having raised up his Son Jesus." It is ascribed to the Son, John v. 21.—"The Son quickeneth whom he will." 1 Cor. xv. 45. "The second Adam was made a quickening spirit." And John x. 18. "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again," says our Lord, when speaking of his life.

9. Sanctification is ascribed to the Spirit, Rom. xv. 16. "Being sanctified by the Holy Spirit." This is ascribed to the Father. Jude verse 1. "Sanctified by God the Father." And to the Son, 1 Cor. i. 2. "Sanctified in (or by) Jesus Christ."

10. The joy and comfort of believers is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, John xiv. 16. "I will pray the Father, and he will send you another Comforter." Rom. xiv. 17. "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in (or by)"

“ by) the Holy Spirit.” This is ascribed to the Father, 2 Cor. i. 3, 4. “ Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who comforteth us in all our tribulation.” Rom. v. 11.—“ We also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” In this last text, it is ascribed both to the Father and the Son. And 2 Theff. ii. 16, 17. “ Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father, who hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation, and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and establish you in every good word and work.” The Lord Jesus Christ “ is our peace.” Eph. ii. 14. And in him “ is consolation,” Philip. ii. 1.

H E A D III.

An Enquiry into the Inferences that appear most native from what the Scriptures teach, relative to the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY SPIRIT.

That the inferences or doctrines that are most native from the texts quoted under the foregoing heads, may be discovered with certainty and clearness; their evidence, or what they testify concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, may be summed up under this head as follows :

S E C T. I.

I. NAMES and actions being ascribed to the Father, which belong properly and exclusively to him, and intelligence being necessarily implied in these : It is evident from

thence, that he is a distinct person, or intelligent being.

The property of being unbegotten or unoriginated, and the act of generating or bringing forth the only begotten Son, (which presupposes the willing of that act), can belong to no other but the Father alone.

2. The names and actions that are properly and exclusively applied to the Father, being expressive of perfection, and supremacy in the highest degree ; it is evident from thence, that the Father is the fountain of all being and perfection, and the Supreme Object in whom all worship should ultimately terminate.

That the Father as a distinct person ; includes the whole unbegotten invisible essence, is the Most High God, and the Supreme Object of worship ; and can only be known, and approached unto, through Jesus Christ : is uniformly testified by the Scriptures of truth. The following are a few of many texts that prove the unity of the one Most High God the Father, and that the way of access to him is only through his only begotten Son : Who is the way, the truth and the life ; the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person.

Mark xii. 29. 32. " Jesus answered and said
 " unto him, The first of all the command-
 " ments is, Hear O Israel ; the Lord our
 " God is one Lord," &c. And the scribe
 said,—“ There is one God, and there is none
 “ other but he.” verse 34. “ Jesus saw that
 “ he answered discreetly,” &c.

Luke

Luke xviii. 19. "None is good, save one; that is God."

1 Tim. ii. 5. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men."

Gal. iii. 20. "A mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one."

1 Cor. viii. 6. "But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things."

2 Cor. i. 3.—"The Father of mercies."

Eph. i. 17.—"The Father of glory."

James i. 17.—"The Father of lights."

Eph. iii. 14, 15.—"The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."

2 Cor. v. 18. "But all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ."

Rom. xv. 6. "That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

John i. 18. "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

John xiv. 16. "Jesus sayeth unto them, I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

Eph. ii. 18. "For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father."

Eph. v. 20. "Giving thanks always for all things unto God even the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."

S E C T. II.

Of Inferences relative to the Son.

1. NAMES and actions, which necessarily

imply intelligence, being ascribed to the Son, as properly and exclusively belonging to him ; it is evident from thence, that he is a proper distinct person, or intelligent being.

The properties of being the beginning, the beginning of JEHOVAH's way, the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, the first-begotten from the dead, and the only begotten of the Father ; as also that of willing to do the Father's will, and executing all his purposes relative to creatures ; can belong to none but the Son of God.

And these names and actions that are thus exclusively ascribed to the Son in Scripture, distinguish him as a proper person or intelligent being, from every other person or intelligent being whatever.

2. The names and actions ascribed to the Son, being clearly expressive of his being the image of the Father, and his agent ; and it being intimated to us by the Scriptures of truth, that the personal glory and perfections, and the will and purposes of the Father, are only to be discovered in and by his only begotten Son ; hence it appears evident, that the Son in his distinct personal subsistence, is the perfect image of the invisible God ; so that in his person, the character of the Father's person is express'd, and all the glory of his perfections shine forth. And hence also it appears, that the being and perfections of the only begotten Son, are infinite in relation to creatures ; that is to say, his being and perfections exceed the being and perfections of all finite creatures, that it is possible for infinite power

to

to produce ; for he is the great agent, through whom alone that power is exerted ; and who will venture to say, that the exertions of infinite power through him, can be circumscribed. Agreeable to this we have his own testimony, Mat. xi. 27.—“ (*οὐδεὶς*) no one knoweth “ the Son but the Father.” The capacity of his person as a receptacle of the Divine fulness, seems also to imply this, Col. i. 19. “ It “ pleased the Father, that in him all fulness “ should dwell.” Col. ii. 9. “ In him dwel- “ leth all the fulness of the God-head bodily.”

That the perfections of power, wisdom and goodness, as they subsist in the person of the Son, are a true and real manifestation, or shining forth of these perfections subsisting in the person of the invisible God, is very clearly intimated in many passages of holy write, John i. 18. “ (*οὐδεὶς*) No one hath seen God at any “ time, the only begotten Son who is in the “ bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.” John xiv. 7. 9. “ If ye had known me, ye “ should have known my Father also.—He “ that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.”

The glory and perfections of the Father shining forth through the Son, in a special manner, in the works of creation and providence ; for, Col. i. 16. “ By him were all “ things created that are in heaven, and that “ are on earth, visible and invisible, whether “ thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or “ powers ; all things were created by him and “ for him.” Verse 17. “ And he is before “ all things, and by him all things consist.” Before him there was no God formed, neither shall

shall there be any after him, Isa. xliii. 10. He being the Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, in all the exertions of divine agency in or upon creatures; he ever hath been and will continue to be, the medium of intercourse and communication, between the infinite, un-originated, and self-existent Being; and every finite creature, even the most noble and excellent that exists.

Thus the first out-goings of the Father's perfections, of power, wisdom and goodness, in and upon creatures, were by him, as we are taught, Eph. iii. 9. "That God created all things by Jesus Christ." And by him these perfections continue to be manifested in their preservation and government; for Isa. ix. 6. "The government shall be upon his shoulders." Being constitute by the Father to be the Supreme God, the Judge, the Lawgiver, and King; to all created nature.

Accordingly we find he frequently appeared in person, or sent messengers to support these characters which belonged to him by the Father's appointment. Nothing can be more plain than this, that it was the Son of God who appeared to Adam, to Abraham, to Jacob and to Moses; since we are expressly taught, that no one hath seen God the Father at any time. Abraham addressed him as the Judge of all the earth, Gen. xviii. 25. "Jacob prayed unto him for a blessing to himself." Gen. xxxii. 26. And to the sons of Joseph, Gen. xlviii. 16.

But notwithstanding the glorious forms in which he appeared, and the high characters
he

he sustained ; yet the Scriptures of the Old Testament do plainly show, that there was one still more high, whose person he represented, and under whose directions he acted. This is not only evident from his being known to the Old Testament believers, by the character of Angel or Messenger ; but also from express declarations ; for he says, Isa. l. 2. 5. “ Is my
 “ hand shortned that it cannot redeem ? or
 “ have I no power to deliver ? Behold, at
 “ my rebuke, I dry up the sea, I make the
 “ rivers a wilderness.—I clothe the heavens
 “ with blackness, and I make sackcloth their
 “ covering.” In these words he asserts and demonstrates his sovereign power ; but immediately shews from whence he derived it, and on whom his confidence did rest ; for he adds,
 “ The Lord God hath given me the tongue
 “ of the learned, that I should know how to
 “ speak a word in season to him that is weary ;
 “ he wakeneth morning by morning ; he
 “ wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned,”
 &c. “ The Lord God will help me, there-
 “ fore shall I not be confounded.”

How admirably does the wisdom and goodness of God the Father shine forth through his only begotten Son ; in thus leading mankind to a discovery of his being and perfections, from the certain evidence of the being and perfections of the Son, who is the way, the truth and the life ; the faithful and true witness.

The glorious forms in which the Son of God appeared, and the demonstrations he gave of irresistible power, incomprehensible wisdom, and boundless goodness ; were every way

way suited to impress the mind with reverential fear, draw forth the most devout exercises of the heart, and excite to the most humble and confident reliance on him ; as the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of the universe. And when the faithful were taught, by this inconceivably glorious Person, that there was one whose representative he only was, by whom he was brought forth, with whom he was brought up, by whose directions he acted, and whose messenger he only was ; what sublime sentiments, and exalted piety, must such a discovery awaken in their hearts ? It would in a manner extend their contemplative faculties as it were beyond their utmost bounds.

3. The names and actions that are peculiarly and exclusively ascribed to the Son, being such as necessarily imply derivation and delegation : It appears evident from thence, that he was capable of laying aside these glorious forms of emptying himself, and becoming poor, which he actually did, when, for the sake of perishing sinners, he assumed the body prepared for him, and humbled himself unto death, even the death of the cross.

His perfect knowledge of the necessary existence of the being and perfections of the Father, and the immutability of his truth ; gave him a firm resolution, and unshaken confidence, to go through all the dreadful and amazing steps of his humiliation state. Isa. l. 7, 8, 9. " For the Lord God will help me, " therefore shall I not be confounded ; therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I " know

“ know that I shall not be ashamed. He is
 “ near that justifieth me,” &c.

The Scriptures do clearly shew, that it was the same individual person who is called the Son of God, that became incarnate, suffered, died, rose again, and is now exalted far above all principality and power. For John i. 14. “ The Word was made flesh,” even that same *Word*, who was with God in the beginning, who was himself God, and by whom all things were made. And Philip. ii. 6, 7, 8. “ He “ who was in the form of God, and thought “ it no robbery to be (*ισα*) as God,” is the same who “ made himself of no reputation, “ and took upon him the form of a servant,” &c. And again, Eph. iv. 9, 10. “ Now in “ that he ascended, what is it but that he also “ descended, first into the lower parts of the “ earth. He that descended, is the same also “ that ascended up far above all heavens, that “ he might fill all things.”

This presents to our view, not only the inconceivable greatness of our Redeemer, but also the incomprehensible extent of his love, and the reality of his gracious designs in favour of sinners, who have destroyed themselves; and so lays the most solid foundation for faith to rest upon, as it confirms by the most demonstrative evidence, the gracious promises revealed in the Scriptures of truth.

S E C T. III.

Of the Inferences relative to the Holy Spirit.

1. THAT the proper distinct personal subsistence of the Holy Spirit, as a distinct agent possessing

lessing intelligence and activity properly his own, can be proved from Scripture, as that of the Father and the Son has been, does not appear; because no name or action appears to be properly and exclusively ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

To suppose that the Holy Spirit is a distinct person from the Father and the Son of the same substance, and in all respects equal with the Father, is not only unsupported from Scripture, but expressly contradicts the clearest doctrine therein revealed; that is, the unity of the supreme Being.

Nothing can be more plain than this, that if the property of being unbegotten or unoriginated be essential to the Father, and exclusively proper to him, no other person can have the same essential property; and so no other person can in all respects be equal to him.

If the Holy Spirit is a proper person, distinct from the Father, and if the Father and the Spirit have the same substance, essence or being, it would follow of consequence, that this essence is divisible, or else that it acts differently at the same time. This appears to be a necessary and unavoidable consequence; for when the Father is said to send the Holy Spirit, it is evident, that sending and being sent, necessarily imply different kinds of agency, or rather the one is active and the other passive. Now, can the consequence be avoided? that either a part of the supreme essence, is sending in the person of the Father, and a part of the same essence is sent in the person of the Spirit, which necessarily implies a division of that one essence or substance; or else, that

that the whole essence or divine Being, is sending and sent at the same instant ; which is as evident a contradiction as can be conceived.

2. The agency and attributes ascribed to the Holy Spirit, being such as appear incompetent for any finite being : It appears from thence, that the Holy Spirit cannot be conceived of as a creature.

The acts of creation, &c. are not only ascribed to the Spirit, as in the texts before quoted, but also the attributes of omnipresence, &c. as Psal. cxxxix. 7. where the Spirit and presence of the Lord are spoke of as synonymous.

3. Since the names, actions and attributes ascribed to the Holy Spirit in Scripture, do not prove proper personality, and yet are such as cannot be ascribed to any creature : It appears from thence, that the Holy Spirit is the outgoing of the perfections of the invisible God, or his effective energy, in and through his only begotten Son.

The name *Spirit*, or Holy Spirit, seems very suitable to express this ; for the *Hebrew* word (רוח *rub*,) rendered spirit, appears primarily to signify *the wind, the breath* of animals, or *air in motion* ; and by analogy is applied to the intelligent nature of man, by which the volitions of the mind and motions of the body are performed ; and so to invisible agents or agencies in general, as Psal. civ. 4. " He maketh his angels (רוחות *rubut*) spirits." It is also applied to the temper and disposition of the mind ; either as it tends to good, as a spirit of wisdom, an upright, meek, humble
C spirit,

spirit, and a spirit of grace and supplication, &c. or as it tends to evil, a spirit of slumber, an evil, haughty, hasty spirit, and a spirit of perverseness, &c. The Greek word (πνεῦμα, *pneuma*) commonly rendered spirit, answers to the Hebrew word (רוּחַ *ruh*) rendered spirit, and hath much the same significations. It is rendered wind, John iii. 8. The tendency of the law, or what divine revelation was given to effect, is called the Spirit, 2 Cor. iii. 6. And the name Spirit, is given to these inspirations that were bestowed on some in the apostolic age, by which they were enabled and excited to declare divine truth, 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

But this last inference is not only supported from the primary signification of the word rendered Spirit, and its various applications; but also from sundry passages in Scripture, where the Holy Spirit appears very plainly to signify the outgoing, or manifestation of the perfections of the invisible God, or his effective energy.

The outgoing of the perfection of power, or *ἐνεργεῖαν τῆς δυνάμεως*, the energy of power, as it is called, Philip. iii. 21. appears to be used as synonymous with the Holy Spirit in the following texts, Luke i. 35. "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." Acts x. 38. "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power." We have no ground to think that in these passages *power* signifies any thing distinct from the *Holy Spirit*; but rather that it is explanatory of what is meant by the Holy Spirit in these

these passages ; which it evidently is, if the words were read as they might be, agreeable to the original ; namely thus, *The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, even the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.*—God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit, even with power. (For the Greek conjunction *καί* kai signifies even as well as and). It was by the Spirit of God that Jesus Christ wrought miracles, Matth. xii. 28. “ But if I by the Spirit of God cast “ out devils.” But this is ascribed to power, Luke v. 17. “ And the power of the Lord “ was present to heal them.” The apostles were to be baptized with the Holy Spirit, Acts i. 5. Which is called a being endued with power from on high, Luke xxiv. 49. The quickening efficacy of the Holy Spirit in raising Christ from the dead, 1 Pet. iii. 18. Is called the working of the mighty power of God, Eph. i. 19. And it appears to be the Holy Spirit that is meant, when it is said, 2 Pet. i. 3. “ According as his divine power “ hath given us all things that pertain to life “ and godliness.”

The Spirit, or Spirit of God, appears also to be synonymous with wisdom, Exod. xxxi. 3. “ And I have filled him with the Spirit of “ God, in wisdom,” &c. The Spirit of God with which Bezaleel is here said to be filled, is said to consist in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge. It is also said, Acts vi. 10. “ And they were not able to resist the “ wisdom and spirit by which he spake,” or they were not able to resist the *wisdom even the spirit* by which he spake. And being full

of goodness, and filled with all knowledge, Rom. xv. 14. Seems to import the same with being filled with the Spirit, Eph. v. 18.

Persons being said to be anointed with the spirit, or to have the spirit poured out, or put upon them; doth also lead us to this idea of the Holy Spirit. And we find the Lord Jesus Christ is said to be anointed with the Holy Spirit, Acts iv. 27.—“Jesus whom thou hast anointed.” Acts x. 38. “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit.” Believers are also said to be anointed with the Holy Spirit, 2 Cor. i. 21. “Now he who stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us is God.” 1 John ii. 20, 27. “But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things;—and the anointing which ye have received of him, abideth in you; and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things.” To much the same purpose, the Spirit is said to be put upon Christ, and poured upon believers. Isa. xlii. 1. “I have put my Spirit upon him.” Matth. xii. 18. “I will put my Spirit upon him.” Prov. i. 23. “I will pour out my Spirit upon you.” Isa. xxxii. 15. “Till the Spirit be poured upon us from on high.” Isa. xlv. 3. “I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed. Ezek. xxxix. 29. “For I have poured out my Spirit upon the house of Israel.” Joel ii. 28. “I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.”

As it would be an impropriety of speech to say one person is anointed with another, or that one person is poured out upon another;

so

so we never find in Scripture, that the Father is said to be poured out, or that Christ or believers are anointed with the Father. Nor yet that the Son is poured out upon believers, or that they are anointed with him. The Father and the Son being each a proper person. This consideration tends also to prove, that the name *Holy Spirit* is an impersonal name, expressing not a person, or intelligent being distinct from the Father and the Son; but the outgoing of the perfections of the invisible God, or his effective energy in and through his only begotten Son.

This idea of the Spirit seems also to accord well with what is said of the Spirit being given to Christ and to believers through him. It is said concerning Christ, that the Father giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him, John iii. 34.; which seems to intimate, that the perfections of power, wisdom and goodness, are communicated to him in an unmeasurable or infinite degree. But as creatures can only receive these through him, and that by measure, or in a finite degree; so a proper measure is given to every one, as infinite wisdom sees fit for every one to profit withal, 1 Cor. xii. 7.

Agreeable to this also, we find the Spirit differently denominated in Scripture. The energy of God the Father communicated to, or operating upon the only begotten Son; is called the Spirit of God, or the Spirit of him that raised Jesus from the dead, as Matth. xii. 28.—“But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God.” Rom. viii. 11. “But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead,”

¶ The same energy as communicated unto, or operating upon creatures, is called the Spirit of God, or the Spirit of Christ; 1 John iv. 12, 13. "No man hath seen God at any time.—Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit." Gal. iv. 6. "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son." Rom. viii. 9. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

As this divine energy, or operative influence, that regulates the universe, and rules in a particular manner in the hearts of true believers, is called the Spirit of God the Father, as proceeding from him as the original source; and is called the Spirit of the Son, as communicated through him to all created beings: So the Spirit is said to be sent by the Father as the first cause of all divine operation, (John xiv. 16, 26.;) and to be sent by the Son, (John xv. 26.) as the medium between infinite, and finite nature, the agent by whom the Father effects all his purposes, and he who by the Father's appointment, is the supreme Governor of the universe. The joint manifested operations, or influence of the Father and the Son, in the world and in the heart, appears to be that which is most commonly expressed by the name Holy Spirit, or Spirit of God; so the promise of the Holy Spirit to dwell with and abide in believers, (John xiv. 17.) is the same with the promise that the Father and the Son would come unto them, and make their abode with them, verse 23.

As there are different names given to the Spirit

Spirit in Scripture, expressive of the original derivation and manner of manifestation, as has been noticed; so there are also different names expressive of the different effects produced by the Spirit, such as the spirit of wisdom, Isa. xi. 2. and Eph. i. 17. The spirit of understanding, the spirit of judgment, and the spirit of might, Isa. xi. 2. The spirit of fear, 2 Tim. i. 7. The spirit of bondage, Rom. viii. 15. The spirit of adoption, Rom. viii. 15. The spirit of faith, 2 Cor. iv. 13. The spirit of grace, Heb. x. 29. The spirit of glory, 1 Pet. iv. 14.

This might be further illustrated from the name *Spirit*, being given to an opposite influence or energy, and that in a very similar way in Scripture. Thus we find the expressions. The spirits of devils, Rev. xvi. 14. The spirit of Antichrist, 1 John iv. 3. The spirit of the world, 1 Cor. ii. 12. These names point out the sources from whence the evil influence express'd by the name Spirit proceeds; and we find others also expressive of its effects, such as the spirit of slumber, Rom. xi. 8. The spirit of error, 1 John iv. 6. The spirit of whoredoms, Hosea iv. 12. And a spirit of perverseness, Isa. xix. 14.

The substance of the foregoing inferences is this, That there is one God the Father, of whom are all things; who is the fountain of all being and perfection, and in whom all religious worship should terminate as the supreme Object. Who being a most perfect, self-existing, free intelligent agent, of his own will, for the communication and manifestation of his perfections, brought forth his only begotten Son, the express image of his person,
and

and brightness of his glory, and that before any creature had a being, or the ages of creature-existence began; by whom he constituted the ages, created, preserves and governs all things.

That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, who is the only begotten Son, and image of the invisible God, and the first born of every creature; who, in due time, was sent into the world, to assume the body prepared for him, suffer and die on account of sinners; who rose again from the dead, and is by the Father exalted to the right hand of the Majesty on high, and constitute the sovereign Lord and final Judge of the quick and dead.

That there is one Spirit or divine energy; which, considered as resting upon the Son of God, is the Spirit or energy of the Father simply considered, as operating immediately from himself, whereby the Father is in the Son, and he in the Father. And, considered as resting upon believers, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit or joint energy of the Father and the Son. Being derived from the Father, and communicated by Christ as Mediator, is properly a mediatory energy or influence, by which the Lord Jesus Christ is said to dwell in believers, and they in him. All the outgoings of divine energy, or communication of divine perfections, as terminating in or upon creatures, seem to come under this designation, whatever be the manner of manifestation or communication.

Our Lord doth very plainly point out the gradation of this energy, John xvii. 23. "I in
" them, and thou in me, that they may be
" made

“made perfect in one.” Agreeable to this also, the apostle Paul says, 1 Cor xi. 3. “But
“I would have you to know, that the head
“of every man is Christ,—and the head of
“Christ is God.”

But as these things relate to objects that cannot be comprehended by finite capacities, our ideas of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, must be exceedingly imperfect; and we even fail in giving a just representation of the imperfect ideas we attain: For we cannot
“order our speech aright by reason of darkness,” and so are ready to “darken counsel
“by words without knowledge.” Job xxxvii. 19. and xxxviii. 2.

Words without ideas, are certainly words without wisdom in the highest sense of the words; it has therefore been humbly attempted under this head, to suggest such ideas as appear to be natively expressed by the words of divine inspiration.

H E A D IV.

An Enquiry into the Strength or Propriety of the Objections, that are, or may be supposed to be made against the foregoing Inferences.

S E C T. I.

Of Objections against what is said of the Person of the Father.

1. It will perhaps be objected, that since it is said, there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one, John v. 7.
there

there must be three persons in one essence ; and therefore the person of the Father cannot be said to include the whole unoriginated essence, more than the Word or the Holy Spirit.

In answer to this it may be observed, that if the word of God is allowed to be its own interpreter, different persons concurring in the same work will not prove equality ; nor will their being said to be one, prove that they are one individual substance. For Paul the apostle says of himself and others, 1 Cor. iii. 9. " We " are labourers together with God." The word συνεργοι, signifies co-workers. John the Baptist came for a witness, John i. 7. and he did bear witness, John v. 33. And the Father himself also hath born witness, verse 37. And 1 John v. 8. There are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, the Water and the Blood. Now nothing can be more evident than this, that the unity of action spoken of in these texts, no way proves equality among those to whom the actions are ascribed ; and since that is the case, witness-bearing, or bearing record, being ascribed to the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, cannot of itself be a proof of equality. And as to the expression *these three are one* ; we find sundry similar expressions in Scripture, and the import of these should be considered in order to the more certain understanding of this. It is said of man and wife, they shall be one flesh, Gen. ii. 24. Matth. xix. 5. Mark x. 8. 1 Cor. vi. 16. And he that is joined to the Lord is said to be one spirit. But none can rationally affirm, that the flesh of a man and his wife are individually the

the same; nor that the spiritual nature of Christ, and the spiritual nature of believers are individually the same substance; though the expressions are more direct for these things, than the words *these three are one*, are to prove one substance: For *substance* is not mentioned in this last; whereas *flesh* and *spirit*, are expressly named in the former. Again it is said, Gen. xi. 6. "The people is one." 1 Cor. iii. 8. "Now he that planteth and he that water-eth are one." By being *one* in these texts, appears to be meant, *one* in sentiment, design, and endeavour; not one in being or essence. When therefore our Lord says, John x. 30. "I and my Father are one." And when it is said, 1 John v. 7. "These three are one." The words *are one*, simply considered, can be no proof that they are one substance; since the very same words have undoubtedly another signification in other places.

But the sense insisted for in the objection, with respect to the words *are one*; is not only rendered doubtful from what has been quoted of similar expressions; but positively overturned by our Lord's express words, John xvii. 11. 22. "That they may be one as we are.—The glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one as we are one." Here in the 11th verse, the union our Lord prays for to his apostles is compared to the union between him and the Father; for he prays that they might be one as he and the Father. And this similarity of union he repeats verse 22. with an emphasis, that they may *be one* (says he) *even as we are one*.

Hence

Hence it appears very evident, that whatever kind of *union* it was that Christ prayed for to his disciples, the same kind of *union* must be meant when he says, *I and my Father are one*; and when it is said, *these three are one*. But plain it is that unity of essence was not that which he prayed for to them; therefore unity of essence cannot be meant by these expressions, *I and my Father are one*, and *these three are one*.

A consideration of these texts with their contexts, may perhaps also help to discover what is meant by the union spoken of. With respect to John x. 30. our Lord had been speaking of the protection his sheep would have by being in his, and his Father's hand; verse 28, 29. "neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father who gave them ($\mu\omicron\iota$) to me is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." Here is plainly one thing ascribed to the Father and the Son; namely that of protecting those called his sheep; and this unity of action and design appears to be that which is intimated in the words that immediately follow, verse 30. "I and my Father are one." Which expression, or phrase, is very similar to what is said of Paul and Apolos, who were pursuing one work and design, namely that of propagating the gospel, 1 Cor. iii. 8. "He that planteth and he that watereth are one."

And with respect to John v. 7. "These three are one." It is very plain that it is the witness or testimony to the truth of the gospel, that the apostle is chiefly insisting on both in the foregoing and following verses. It appears

pears therefore to be the unity of testimony, not essence, that is spoken of in the text. And from the whole of the texts with which this has been compared, it is evident that it cannot support the objection that is founded upon it.

2. It will perhaps be objected further, that the apostles being commanded to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit ; these three must be one substance equal in power and glory.

Answer, It is difficult to conceive how an argument for equality and unity of essence can be drawn from this command. It has been alledged that its being said, in the *name*, and not in the *names*, is a proof of the unity contended for in the objection. There appears, however, to be no strength, to say no worse of it, in this form of reasoning ; for it is very evident that the word *name* is to be understood as if it were repeated with the Son and the Holy Spirit. For when it is said, “ Baptizing them in the “ name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit ; ” it is the same, or of the same import, as to say, “ Baptizing them in the “ name of the Father, and in the name of the “ Son, and in the name of the Holy Spirit.” If this is not the sense what does the name refer to ? or what is meant by it ? If it does not refer to, or mean the name of the Father, the name of the Son, and the name of the Holy Spirit ; it would seem that the text should in part, have read the very reverse of what it doth ; that is, it should have read, Baptizing them in the *name* not of the Father, nor the Son, nor the Holy Spirit, but in the *name* that denotes the

unity of their essence. I suppose any one may see the absurdity of this, and what difficulties it would present to a serious enquirer ; while the text, as it stands, is suited to convey instruction to the most ordinary capacity.

The expression, or phrase, *in the name* ; sometimes signifies *by the authority*, or *power* of the person expressed by the name. As Acts iii. 6. “ In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk.” And Acts iv. 7, 10. “ By what power, or by what name have ye done this ?—By the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified.” The words rendered *by* in the 7. and 10. verses, are the same in the original with that rendered *in*, chap. iii. 6. But it is a different word that is used, Matth. xxviii. 19. In this it is *en* a preposition which signifies, *in*, *into*, *to*, or *unto* ; most commonly *into*.

Baptism appears therefore to signify, an entrance into the profession of a belief of, and communion and fellowship with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit ; and by the administration of this ordinance, the name of God is as it were put upon a person, and is openly shown or manifested when what is signified by that ordinance is truly professed ; and hence the followers of the Lamb are said to have the Father’s name upon their foreheads. To be baptized in or into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, may therefore fitly signify, that thereby baptized persons have the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit put upon them, and are entered into an obligation to profess whatever

ever the Scriptures reveal concerning the Father, Son and Spirit.

Baptism seems chiefly to represent, a dying unto sin, and a living unto righteousness; for Rom. vi. 3, 4.—“ So many of us were baptized (*εις*) into Jesus Christ, were baptized (*εις*) into his death. We are buried with him “ by baptism, that like as Christ was raised “ from the dead by the glory of the Father ; “ so we also should walk in newness of life.” When therefore the thing signified by baptism is effected, through the efficacy of the Holy Spirit communicated through Jesus Christ; the love of God the Father therein manifested, being apprehended, will shed abroad a love to him in the heart ; and a fellowship with him and his Son Jesus Christ being effected ; it will be more and more promoted by the communion and fellowship of the Holy Spirit, ministering joy and peace, through the knowledge of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.

From the whole it appears, that this text Matth. xxviii. 19. teaches nothing particularly decisive, as to the import of the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit ; but obliges in general to a belief of what is more fully revealed concerning each of them in the Scriptures at large.

3. It is strongly urged by some, that the plural form of the name ALEIM, generally rendered God ; and the expressions, let us make man in *our* image, and the man is become like one of *us*, and such like ; are clear proofs of a plurality of persons in the unity of the essence.

A more particular answer to what is argued from these, and from the cherubim, &c. is reserved for an appendix ; where the original words, &c. will be more particularly enquired into. Only in the general, it may be observed, that any person of ordinary capacity who can read the English translation of the Bible, may rest fully satisfied, that they are in no danger from not believing the name *Aleim* to be plural, in the text where this sense is most insisted for, and where this plural sense is most necessary in order to establish the doctrine of a plurality in the unity of the essence. The text that is most insisted on for this purpose, is Deut. iv. 6. "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." In this text, the word rendered Lord, is * IEUE or JEHOVAH, and the word rendered God, is * ALEIM ; hence it is argued, *Aleim* being of a plural form, and *Ieue* of a singular form ; a plurality in unity is thereby proved. It is however very unfavourable for this argument, that our Lord has interpreted this verse very differently ; for Mark xii. 29. "Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord," &c. None can say that the Greek word Θεός rendered *God*, is plural. It seems therefore plain, that our Lord did not view the word *Aleim* to be plural in the sense that is required to support the argument for a plurality in unity ; nor did he make any use of the text to support this doctrine, which the objectors think so necessary to

* For the grammatical construction, and signification of these words, see the Appendix.

to be believed: On the contrary, their doctrine is reversed by their own form of reasoning; for, say they, because *Aleim* is plural and *Jehovah* singular; therefore a plurality in the unity of the essence is proved. But Christ the Son of God who is the best interpreter, hath rendered the word *Aleim* singular; therefore *Aleim* being singular, and *Jehovah* singular, an unity of person, or one person in the essence, is proved.

With respect to the expression, "let us make man in our image." If it is only considered, that Jesus Christ the only begotten Son of God, was brought forth before any creature was made, that he was with God the Father in the beginning, and brought up with him: In that case, it is plain, that the Father might, with strict propriety, say to the Son, Let us make man, &c. This consideration of the Father and the Son, as personally distinct from the beginning, accounts for all the plural expressions we find in Scripture; so that all these do perfectly agree with the foregoing inferences, though none of them will prove equality, or a plurality of persons in one essence as may be more fully shown in the Appendix.

S E C T. II.

Of Objections against what is said of the Person of the Son.

It will likely be objected by some, "That what is said concerning the person of the Son, is inconsistent with that doctrine, which holds the Son to be co-equal and co-eternal with the Father; which doctrine has been

“ long and generally held by the church, and
 “ supported by the testimony of Scripture.”

That what is said concerning the Son in the foregoing inferences, is inconsistent with his being co-equal and co-eternal with the Father, is readily granted ; and that the doctrine of co-equality and co-eternity, &c. hath been long and generally held, is not denied ; but it is humbly presumed, that the Scriptures of truth will give no testimony in support thereof, if allowed to speak their own language. With respect to church authority, it does not well become Protestants to urge that as a proof of any doctrine ; but it appears to be the chief, if not the only authority that can be brought in support of it, like many other doctrines that have been fabricated and established, in what Papists call the *Catholic church*.

Mr *Brightman* observes, that in the first council of *Nice*, when they established their decrees concerning the Trinity, and the observation of Easter ; they also made canons concerning ecclesiastic dignity, and gave the Bishop of Rome the primacy of order.—It is no very promising circumstance, (at least for its conformity to the simple truth,) that it should be enacted by the same council that enacted superstition, and favoured antichristian usurpation in the church ; and that it was mostly encouraged and promoted in the church of Rome, which has been so remarkable for *confused mysteries*, as to acquire in sacred write, the name of MYSTERY BABYLON, that is, *confused mystery*, or *mystery of confusion*.

The manner in which it is alledged the
 Scriptures

Scriptures support the doctrine of equality, &c. is, by ascribing the same names, works and worship to the Father and the Son.

In answer to this, it may be observed in general, that what is here alledged is not strictly true; nay, it is false in the chief and fundamental parts. For it has been shown, that the Scriptures ascribe names and actions to the Father, that are no where ascribed to the Son, which appear sufficiently to justify the foregoing inferences. But some names and actions are ascribed in common to the Father and the Son; and from these it is argued to the following effect.

1. The name God being frequently applied to the Father, and sundry times also applied to the Son; it is argued from thence, that the Son must be equal with the Father.

Answer, The texts that are commonly brought for proof of this, viz. Psal. xlv. 6. and Heb. i. 8. are very unfavourable for the argument; for though the Son is called God in these texts, yet the Father is called his God; and this as evidently proves an inequality between the Father and the Son, as the Son's being called God over all, proves an inequality between him and all created beings.

But if the name God being applied to the Son, will simply prove that he is equal with the Father, must not the application of it to others prove with equal force, that they also are equal with him. We find it applied to men, Exod. vii. 1. and xxi. 6. "And the Lord said unto Moses, see I have made thee a god unto Pharoah.— Then his master shall

“shall bring him unto the judges.” The word rendered *judges* is *gods* in the *Hebrew*. Also Psal. lxxxii. 6. “I said ye are gods, but ye shall die like men.” The name *god* is also applied to angels, Psal. xcvi. 7. “Worship him all ye gods.” Which is rendered Heb. i. 6. “And let all the angels of God worship him.” From these applications of this very important name, it may be seen how inconclusive this argument is, which is founded on a similarity of names. For the import or signification of this name, and some others, see the Appendix, where this subject is intended to be more particularly treated of. Only it may here be further observed, that these applications of the name *God*, do clearly shew that it is sometimes used in a supreme, and sometimes in a subordinate sense. It is applied to the Father in the most supreme sense, he being the God as well as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and through him the God and Father of all; and no one being ever said to be his God or Father. The Father is therefore God as none else is. This name is also applied to the Son in a supreme sense, compared to that in which it is applied to any creature, for he is God and Lord over all created beings. But still in a subordinate sense compared to that in which it is applied to the Father, who is his God, and by whom he is made both Lord and Christ. And thus the Lord Jesus Christ, is truly God in a sense in which none else is.

2. It is argued, that the same works or acts are ascribed to the Father and the Son, therefore

fore the Father and the Son are equal in power and glory.

Answer, It is evident, that some works or acts are ascribed to the Father in Scripture, which are no where ascribed to the Son, as before noticed; so that this proof, allowing it to be conclusive, so far as it goes, would be very defective.

But the works that are most insisted on, in favour of the objection, may be considered, such as creation, regeneration and working miracles

That all things were created by Jesus Christ the Son of God, is very evident from many places of Scripture, as Col. i. 16. "For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are upon earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers, all things were created by him and for him." John i. 3. "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." It is also very evident, that the Father is the Creator of all things; this is supposed in the objection, and therefore no proof need be offered here. Now, it is evident from the nature of things, that two or more agents cannot do the same work, so as each of them to do the whole of it in the same manner; for if the whole is done by one, there can remain nothing for the other to do. There is none among the sons of men that can be compared unto God, neither is there any work that they can do like his, either as to matter or manner; yet, a consideration of some of these may help to lead us toward a more just and

and distinct consideration of what he hath revealed to us, concerning the manner of his working. What is said of the building of the temple, may perhaps tend a little to this. We find the building of the temple ascribed to Solomon, 1 Kings vi. 14. 2 Chron. chapters 3. and 4. where he is said in particular to have made *a molten sea*, &c. Now this same work is ascribed to Hiram, 1 Kings vii. 14. "He came to Solomon, and did all his work;" and among other things it is particularly said, verse 23. "he made a molten sea." I suppose no body will infer, that because the same work is ascribed to Solomon and to Hiram, therefore they were upon a rank of equality; it is very easy to conceive in what sense this work was done both by the one and the other. It was done by Solomon, in that he laid out the plan, provided the materials, and gave subsistence to Hiram in the execution of the work; and it was done by Hiram in that he executed the work according to the directions he received. Now though we cannot conceive of God's works and the manner in which he executes them, as we can of those of men; yet we ought to form our opinions of them as near as we can according to the revelation he hath been pleased to favour us with. By this we are taught, that *there is one God, the Father of whom are all things; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things*. Here we find a plain difference of expression, relative to the Father and the Son; all things are said to be *of* the Father, and *by* the Lord Jesus Christ. This difference
of

of expression is certainly intended to convey some instruction ; and what can be supposed so likely as this, namely, That all things being of God the Father, denotes that they are all of or from him as the first cause ; and that their being by Jesus Christ, denotes that they are all by him as the medium through whom the Father's perfections are exerted upon creatures, and he by whose immediate agency creation-work was effected. So we are expressly taught, Eph. iii. 9. " That God created " all things by Jesus Christ." From which it is evident, that creation is not ascribed in the same manner to the Father, and to the Son. Those who deny this conclusion, ought to produce some text, where all things are said to be of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that he created all things by God the Father. Till this is done, the doctrine of equality can never be said in truth, to be proved from the creation of all things being ascribed to the Son. Since it is so evidently ascribed to him in a different manner from that in which it is ascribed to the Father.

With respect to regeneration, it is very true that it is effected by Jesus Christ, who was made a quickening Spirit, to revive such as are dead in trespasses and sins ; and who says of himself, " Behold, I make all things new." It is said, 1 Pet. i. 3. " Blessed be the God and " Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath " begotten us again unto a lively hope by the " resurrection of Jesus Christ." In this text regeneration is ascribed to the Father ; but it is by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. After
Christ

Christ arose from the dead, he ascended as a glorious Conqueror, unto the right hand of the Majesty on high ; and having received gifts for men, as Psal. lxviii. 18. he gave gifts to men, as Eph. iv. 8. appointing some apostles, &c. whose ministry he made use of for effecting regeneration ; accordingly the apostle Paul says to the Corinthians, *I have begotten you through the gospel.* But will any say that because believers are said to be begotten of God the Father, and that the Corinthian believers were begotten by the apostle Paul, therefore Paul is equal with the Father ? Surely not ; though the begetting unto a lively hope is meant in both places. How little then can be drawn from the same works being ascribed to different persons, in proof of equality ; unless it can be shown that the persons have performed the works in the same manner, equally independent of each other.

But further, the power of working miracles, in which the operations of nature are counteracted, or exceeded ; being no less an evidence of divine power, or the power of the Most High God, than creation itself ; it is alledged that whoever is possessed of this power, must be equal with God the Father.

It is very certain indeed, that Christ possessed this power ; but it is also certain, that a power of this kind was also possessed by his apostles, and that (it would seem) in a very similar manner, and no smaller degree, in some respect. For says our Lord, John xiv. 12.
 “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that be-
 “ lieveth in me, the works that I do, shall he
 “ do,

“do, and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to my Father.” Now if curing the diseased, and raising the dead, be a proof that the Son is equal with the Father; must not the same works performed by the apostles, prove the same thing concerning them? It will be said, the apostles did all their miracles in the name of Christ, and by a power derived from him. This is very true; but did not Christ perform all the miracles he did, in the name of the Father, and by virtue of a power received from him? for, John v. 19.—“Jesus answered and said unto them, “verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what things he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise.” Verse 30. “I can of mine own self do nothing, as I hear I judge.” John viii. 28. “I do nothing of myself, but as the Father hath taught me, I speak these things.”

The miracles that were performed by the Son of God, appear therefore to be no proof of his equality with the Father; the above texts prove the reverse; nor do we ever find him making use of them for that purpose; but urging them as proofs that the Father had sent him, John v. 36. “The works which my Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me.” John x. 25. “The works that I do in my Father’s name, they bear witness of me.” It might be observed that the same form of expression is here used by our Lord, that is used by the Apostles Peter and

E

John,

John, Acts iii. 6. and iv. 10. Where they say (iv) in or by the name of Jesus, &c. Our Lord says (iv) in or by the name of my Father. The evidence of the miracles wrought by our Lord went to prove his divine mission, and the truth of his doctrines; the evidence of those performed by his apostles, went to prove that they were sent by Jesus Christ, that he was the promised Messiah whom the Father had sent into the world, and that as he taught those things that he had heard of the Father; so they taught those things that they had heard and learned of him. For as the Father had sent him into the world, even so also he sent them into the world.

3. It is argued that Christ is an object of worship; and worship is due to God only; therefore Christ is God equal with the Father.

This argument, like the former, is either loose and inconclusive, or else it proves too much. For it is said, 1 Chron. xxix. 20. "And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads and worshipped the Lord and the king." Worship is here equally ascribed to the Lord and the king; but will any venture to argue from thence that the congregation considered the king as equal with the Lord? I humbly think, they would worship the Lord as the source and supreme cause of their being, and all their happiness; and that they would worship the king, as one whom the Lord had raised to a peculiar dignity, and made an instrument in his hand to promote both their civil and religious interests. But such is the person-
al

al glory and dignity of the Son of God, and so near and intimate is his union with the Father ; that it seems difficult, by any particular definition, to make a proper distinction in the worship due to the Father and the Son. Only it is very plain in the general, that the Father is worshipped through the mediation of the Son, as the one Mediator between God and men ; but there is no mediator through whom the Son is to be worshiped. Which very plainly shews, that the worship that ought to be given to the Son is not in every respect the same with that which ought to be given to the Father.

But it will perhaps be said, that the worship must be the same in every respect ; for John v. 23. “ All men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.”

In answer to this, it may be observed, that in whatever respects there may be a similarity ; yet there must still be a difference as has been noticed, between the Mediator, and him that is to be worshiped through that Mediator ; and if the text is considered in connection with the context, instead of proving equality, it will prove the very reverse. For (verses 19, 20, 21, 22.)

“ Then answered Jesus and said unto them,
 “ verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do
 “ nothing of himself, but what things he seeth
 “ the Father do ; for what things soever he
 “ doth, these also doth the Son likewise. For
 “ the Father loveth the Son and sheweth him
 “ all things that himself doth, and he will shew
 “ him greater works than these, that ye may
 “ marvel. For as the Father raiseth up the
 “ dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son
 “ quickeneth

“quickeneth whom he will. For the Father
 “judgeth (*ovdeste*) no one, but hath committed all
 “judgment unto the Son : That all men should
 “honour the Son even as they honour the Fa-
 “ther ; he that honoureth not the Son honour-
 “eth not the Father which hath sent him.”

Here we have the testimony of the true and faithful witness, that the Son can do nothing of himself, &c. that the Father hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men should honour him, even as they honour the Father ; and that those who honour him not on this account, and in this manner, honour not the Father who hath sent him. Surely these passages instead of proving equality, do clearly prove what our Lord says of himself in express words in another place, (if any sayings of his can receive proof, for they surely need none) ; what he says in the place alluded to is, “ My Father
 “ is greater than I.”

There appears therefore, to be no conclusive argument, in favour of the objection, deducible from the worship ascribed to the Son of God, in Scripture.

It will perhaps still be objected, that the Scriptures will support the doctrine of equality, particularly John v. 18. and x. 33. Philip. ii. 6.

Answer, The first and second of these texts, shew a very great similarity between the conduct of the Jews, and that of the objectors. The last do generally charge things upon those they oppose, which they never held ; and the first charged things upon our Lord which his words would not bear.

It is said, John v. 18. “ Therefore the Jews
 “ fought

“sought the more to kill him, because he had
 “not only broken the Sabbath-day; but also
 “said that God was his Father, making him-
 “self equal with God.” Now, supposing the
 Jews mean such an equality as is pled for in the
 objection, can any say that our Lord admitted
 their inference as just? We have his answer
 in the very next verse, thus, “Then Jesus an-
 “swered and said unto them, verily, verily I say
 “unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself,
 “&c.” Is it not plain to the meanest capacity,
 that the inference made by the Jews and the
 answer given by our Lord, are very different?
 The inference the Jews make is, that he made
 himself equal with God, because he said God was
 his Father. In the answer that our Lord gave,
 he asserts, the Son can do nothing of himself,
 but what he seeth the Father do,—these also
 doth the Son. From which it appears that
 the doctrine of equality, is not the doctrine of
 the blessed Jesus; but the doctrine of his false
 accusers, betrayers and murderers. And as was
 already hinted, it was afterwards received, che-
 rished and brought to maturity, under the name
 of a christian doctrine, in that apostate church
 that has betrayed the true interests of christia-
 nity, and murdered many of the faithful wit-
 nesses of Christ. What words can be conceiv-
 ed of as more decisive than those made use of
 by our Lord? He confirms what he was about
 to say with an emphatic affirmation, *verily, verily*;
 and then he asserts, *the Son can do nothing of him-
 self*, &c. By which he expressly shews that son-
 ship and equality are incompatible.

The second text, John x. 33. is much the

same. For here, "The Jews answered saying, "for a good work we stone thee not; but for "blasphemy, and because that thou being a man "makest thyself God." The answer immediately follows; "Jesus answered them, is it not "written in your law, I said ye are gods? If he "called them gods, unto whom the word of "God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him whom the Father hath "sanctified and sent into the world, thou blasphemest; because I said I am the Son of God."

These words of our Lord contain a twofold answer to the charge of blasphemy, which the Jews made against him; for he first intimates that though he had claimed the title or name God, it could not be called blasphemy in him, since that name had been given to men, in that law to which they professed to adhere. Second, he intimates that he had not even claimed this name however much intitled to it; all he had said being only that he was the Son of God. And in this answer he is so far from claiming equality with the Father, that he says, he was sanctified and sent into the world by him. It appears therefore, that these texts instead of supporting the objection, do clearly prove that the doctrine objected is true.

With respect to the third, *viz.* Philip. ii. 6. "Who being in the form of God thought it "no robbery to be equal with God." A particular enquiry into this verse, is intended in the *Appendix*; it may therefore be sufficient at present to observe, that he who was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be as God; (for so the words may be read, as will be show;)

shown ;) the same individual person, made himself of no reputation, (Gr. emptied himself,) and took upon him the form of a servant. Now it is evident that a person who is altogether immutable cannot be emptied or take the form of a servant ; if therefore the Son were in every respect equal with the Father, he would be as incapable of these things, that are ascribed to him in this chapter, as the Father is.

But to all this, it will perhaps be objected further, that all this reasoning proceeds from ignorance of the Mediator's person ; that the union of the divine and human natures in the person of the Mediator, lays a proper foundation for all these inferior characters and works ascribed to him in Scripture, while his divine nature lays a foundation for his being equal in all respects with the Father.

In answer to this objection, it may be observed, that those who want to support it, ought to let it be known what they mean by the person of the Mediator, as consisting of a divine and human nature ; whether they think there is only one knowing faculty, will and activity in the Son of God, or hath each nature a distinct knowing faculty, will and activity ? If the first is their opinion, they must either suppose, that the divine faculties are brought down to the human, or that the human are raised to the divine ; or else that the divine and human are so united, as that the knowing faculty, will and activity of the Mediator, are a medium between divine and human. If the last is their opinion, they must hold

hold that the Mediator consists of two persons; for a proper distinct knowing faculty or intelligence, will and activity, certainly constitutes personality, so far as we can conceive of it.

They will perhaps hold this last opinion, and deny its consequences; but how justly the impartial may judge. They cannot however deny, that according to this opinion, the Son knows, wills and acts, some things as God, and some things as man; all the strength of the objection, (if it has any,) lies in this. And according to this, it may be affirmed of the person of the Son of God, (thus composed of, or possessing faculties different and distinct in their exertions;) that he knows and knows not, wills and wills not, does and does not at the same time. But this would require better evidence to support it, than has as yet been brought.

They should also have told what they mean by distinct persons in the God-head or Deity, as they speak. Whether they think each person is a distinct intelligent Being, possessing a distinct will and activity, or that the Supreme Essence is one intelligent Being, having one will and activity? If the first, how will they free themselves from the doctrine, of what is called tritheism or three Gods? If the last, where is the foundation for distinct personality?

But whatever they mean by a distinction of persons in the Supreme Essence, it is plain, that they hold one person to be unbegotten, another begotten, and another to proceed from the other two. In the Westminster Confession of Faith, (which is held as a standard of orthodoxy by the church of Scotland, and several

ral parties that have separated therefrom,) it is said, "The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding. The Son is eternally begotten of the Father, and the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son." This definition seems to be very unexceptionable in general, except the expressions *eternally begotten* and *eternally proceeding*, which are capable of exceptionable senses. One exceptionable sense of eternal generation is, that it is a continued act. To suppose this, would be attended with the greatest absurdity; for it would suppose that the act of generation ever hath gone on, and ever will continue to go on; and consequently never will be completed: and so the person of the Son neither is nor ever will be completely brought forth; which is contrary to the Scripture doctrine in general, and to those texts in particular that speak of his generation as a finished act, as Psal. ii. 7. Prov. viii. 24, 25. That the sending forth of the Holy Spirit, is an eternally continued act, is every way agreeable to the Scripture account of it; for it is by virtue of that divine energy called the Holy Spirit, which the Father communicates, or sends forth through or by the mediation of his only begotten Son; that all his purposes relative to the world in general, and believers in particular, are carried into effect. And by virtue of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in a full measure, in the hearts of believers in their glorified state, they will be filled with all the fulness of God, be satisfied with his likeness, and rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Another

Another exceptionable sense of eternal generation is, that he was begotten, or the generation of the Son completed, as soon as the person of the Father or the unbegotten essence existed.

It is very plain, that the name *Father* is a relative name, as well as that of *Creator*, expressing a certain kind of relation; and as the relative name *Creator* could not be applied to the Most High, till the act of creation was exerted; so neither could the relative name *Father* be applied to him, till the act of generation was exerted. And it is as plain, that there is a twofold priority, that the person who creates has, in respect to what is created by him; for first, his existence is necessarily supposed before he could exert the act of creation; and second, the exertion of that act is necessarily supposed to be before or precede, the existence of any creature. The same things may be said of generation, the existence of the person who generates, is necessarily supposed to precede the act of generation; and that act must also go before the existence of the person generated.

It is certainly a very just inference to infer, that since God created all things by Jesus Christ, therefore no creature can be co-eternal with the Father or of equal antiquity with his Son Jesus Christ. And is not the inference equally just and plain, that since the Most High God generated or brought forth his only begotten Son; therefore the Son cannot be co-eternal with him by whom he was brought forth. If any shall say, the Son may be co-eternal with the

the Father, though we cannot conceive how it can be so ; another may also say, the creatures may be co-eternal with the Creator, tho' we cannot conceive how it can be so.

That co-eternity of persons, or eternal generation, so much insisted for by many, seems therefore not only to be above our reason, as they say ; but to be directly contrary to all the reasons and intelligence that God has been pleased to endow us with, in this our present state of existence.

Several writers have discovered these insurmountable difficulties, that press upon the doctrine of eternal generation, and therefore have given it up ; though they have still endeavoured to maintain the doctrine of a Trinity in the unity of the essence. These have taken very different methods to ascertain the true sonship of Christ ; some have held that sonship has always been applicable to Christ, ever since, and even before the world began, in consequence of his human soul being brought forth before the world began. This may at least be considered as a step toward, but does not seem to take in the proper idea of the person of Christ in his pre-incarnate state ; the terms *human soul* and *super-angelic spirit*, being rather too diminutive to express the pre-incarnate nature of the Son of God. Some again seem to hold that the sonship of Christ, is founded on his appointment to certain offices, in the œconomy of redemption ; but since, according to them, the Holy Spirit, is also appointed to certain offices, or has certain works assigned in that œconomy : sonship according to that plan,

plan, would be as properly applied to the Holy Spirit. A third has asserted, that the true sonship of Christ rests wholly upon his incarnation; and that sonship could never be applied to him till after his incarnation. Such as assert this, seem not to advert that there are other relations besides that of sonship, which imply inferiority, such as Angel or Messenger, and the Anointed, the Messiah or the Christ; and these are in the Old Testament applied to one, who then was, as well as now is, the Son of God. To deny that sonship was applicable to Christ till his incarnation, is also contrary to several texts, such as Col. i. 15. Rev. iii. 14. &c. which have formerly been taken notice of.

These short remarks may serve to show the strange and unaccountable conduct of those who will hold the doctrine of eternal generation, in a sense directly contrary to both Scripture and reason; and which has been given up as indefensible, by those who seem to be the most cool impartial, and diligent enquirers of their own party.

There is indeed a sense in which eternal generation may be reasonably admitted, and which the Scriptures will support; and that is, a generation in eternity, or before the commencement of time. For as any action done in time, may be called a temporary action; so an action done in eternity or unmeasured duration, may perhaps with some propriety be called eternal, however near it might be to the commencement of time, or by however small a portion of unmeasured duration it might be separated from it. There seems to be no difficulty,

ficulty, nor does there appear to be any contradiction, in saying the Son of God was begotten before the world was, and even before the most ancient age, or measure of creature existence began ; but to say the person of the Father had no existence prior to the existence of the Son, is to connect the act of generation with the beginning of the Father's person, (if the expression might be used) ; and indeed according to the sense in which eternal generation is generally pled for, it might with as much propriety be said, the Father eternally began to be, as that the Son was eternally begotten. Therefore according to the native consequences of their own doctrine about the co-eternity of the person of the Father, and the person of the Son, they connect the generation of the Son with the beginning of the being of the Father's person ; but since the being of the Father's person had no beginning, the Son (according to their plan,) could have no generation. This consequence cannot be avoided by them ; for if they admit the smallest degree of priority in the person of the Father, it destroys their favourite point, the co-eternity of the Son, or their sense of eternal generation.

It might be further remarked, that in the definition given in the Westminster Confession above quoted ; an equality of persons is so far from being express'd, that it is contradicted in the plainest terms. It is said, " The Father is " of none, neither begotten nor proceeding." The person who is of none, nor begotten of any, certainly possesses a dignity and superiori-

ty, above the person who is of him, and is even begotten of him. To express the equality of persons by such unequal descriptions, or to say that such unequal descriptions are expressive of equality, seems rather like contradiction, than reasoning.

The idea of Supreme Deity, and that of being begotten, are altogether incompatible; for, according to any idea **that we can form** of generation, or being begotten, it must either denote the giving a being to what existed not before, or the giving a different mode of being to what did exist before. And to apply generation in any of these senses to the Supreme Essence, destroys the idea of self-existence and immutability, which both Scripture and reason direct us to entertain of that Supreme Essence.

But not only does a comparison of the ideas, which by Scripture and reason we are taught to form of the Supreme Being, and of generation, forbid our including the idea of Supreme Essence in that of sonship; or in the term *Son of God*; but also the express declarations of the Son himself, Mark xiii. 32. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." John iii. 35. "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." John v. 19. "The Son can do nothing of himself." Verse 22. "The Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son." These texts, with many others, do plainly shew that the Son there spoken of, is inferior to the Father, both in knowledge,

ledge, power, and authority. Agreeable to what our Lord expressly testifies, where he says, *My Father is greater than I.* Will any still in opposition to all this, affirm, that the Father is no greater than the Son; but that they are in all respects equal? If they do, it seems needless to use arguments, or produce evidence to convince them; since we have here the most certain evidence that possibly can be had, even the testimony of *him* who is *truth itself*, exprest in the most simple, plain, and decisive manner.

But suppose their favourite scheme were allowed them; though they might think they could solve some difficulties at the expence of dividing the person of Christ, yet they will find other difficulties press upon their scheme, (if they are not past feeling,) from which this distinction, or rather division of the person of Christ will give them no relief.

It was before hinted, that according to the distinction on which the objection is founded, the same things may be either affirmed or denied of the person of Christ at the same time, and with equal truth. For instance, one may say, Christ can do all things of himself; another may say, nay, he can do nothing of himself. In order therefore to speak with certainty, they must leave the Scripture stile, and speak of all his distinct acts as the acts of the distinct natures of which his person consists, and not as personal acts. And so they must say, it was as man he knew not the day of judgment; as man he received all things from the Father; as man he could do nothing of

himself; as man he prayed; in short, all his mediatory acts will by this plan, be the acts of his human nature; and so he is made in every respect as much a human mediator, as he is by the Socinian plan. There appears to be this difference indeed, that they say the human nature is united to a person in Deity, or a third of Deity; (for the whole Deity, or God-head, is by them supposed to consist of three;) whereas the Socinians say that the human nature is united to the whole God-head or divine nature. The Socinians indeed do not call this a personal union, but seem to consider it as close and intimate, as it is possible for God to unite a true body and reasonable soul to himself; the Athanasians cannot conceive the union to be closer, whatever unmeaning terms they may clothe it with.

It was noticed, that there are difficulties which press upon this scheme, from which the distinction will give no relief. These difficulties press equally upon the Athanasian and Socinian schemes.

We are told, that a thing may be said to be done by a person, which, strictly speaking, is applicable only to one nature of the person. This is admitted; and it must certainly be admitted also, that what cannot be applied to any nature of a person, is in nowise applicable to the person; or, that what will agree with no nature in a person, can never be said of that person.

It is said, however, of the person of Christ, "that though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor," 2 Cor. viii. 9. Now, to what nature

nature upon the plan of the objectors, will this apply? not to the divine nature; for that being immutable, could admit of no change or diminution of any kind. Nor will it apply to the human nature; for that having never enjoyed a state of riches before it appeared in a state of poverty, could in no sense be said either to have been rich, or yet to become poor. Again, Philip. ii. 7. "He who was in the form of God, and thought no robbery to be as God; made himself of no reputation (*Gr. emptied himself,*) and took upon him the form of a servant." The same reasons forbid the applying of this to the divine nature as the former, and also to the human nature. For, to suppose the divine nature capable of being emptied, is to suppose it capable of mutability; and the human nature having had no existence at all, before the incarnation, much less a fulness, it could with no propriety be said to be emptied. I shall at present only mention another text, John xvii. 5. Where our Lord addressing his Father, says, "And now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Now it might be asked again, To what nature will this apply? There appears to be several things against its being applied to the divine nature, as, 1. The divine nature being incapable of any thing that implies dependence or want, cannot be supposed capable of praying in the manner here expressed. 2. The divine nature being unchangeable both as to being and perfection and happiness, it could never be deprived or divested of any glory or happiness,

piness, which it enjoyed before the world was.

Some will perhaps say, the glory of the divine nature of Christ was veiled ; but the prayer is not to unveil his glory, but to glorify him or restore a glory he had before the world was. Moreover the prayer is not simply that the Father might glorify him, which might perhaps imply a manifestation of his glory to others ; but it is a prayer that the Father would glorify him, with his ownself ; *glorify me with thine ownself*, says our blessed Redeemer. Allowing them therefore, any sense they please to put upon it, it overthrows their scheme ; for when they say, the glory of the divine nature of Christ was veiled by his humiliation, and that this veiled divine nature prayed for the removal of that veil, it necessarily supposes that the divine nature or essence is so far divided as that one part of it is capable of praying, and another part of being prayed to ; one part of it being veiled, and another of being unveiled, at the same time. How absurd and inconsistent is this ? and even overthrows their own doctrine which holds the divine nature of Christ to be individually the same, and in all respects equal with the nature or essence of the Father. It appears therefore, that in no sense will the text apply to the divine nature of Christ, in a consistency with their own principles. Neither will it apply to his human nature ; for, since that nature had no existence till some thousands of years after the creation of the world ; it could not enjoy a glory before the world was. These and many other such difficulties press upon both the Athanasian and Socinian schemes of

of explaining the doctrine of the Trinity ; but are quite removed by receiving the Scripture doctrine concerning this sublime subject. The Scriptures do clearly shew that the person of Christ was begotten of the Father before any creature existed ; for he is called the first born of every creature, Col. i. 15. And, as noticed before, he is also said to be brought forth before the mountains, *וְעַל*. He was set up or anointed *מִעוֹלָם* before the age, *מֵרֵאשִׁית* before the beginning, *מִקְדָּמֵי אָרֶץ* before the things more ancient than the earth, Prov. viii. 23. And his goings forth have been before antiquity, before the days of the age, Micah v. 2.

It may perhaps be thought by some, that the expression “ first born of every creature,” is too diminutive ; for though it gives the priority to Christ, yet it ranks him as it were among creatures. But as to this and every thing else that God hath been pleased to reveal, we ought to submit to his instruction, and form our faith agreeable to his testimony. Even this expression, *first born of every creature*, is very similar to what is said, Rom. viii. 28. Where he is called *the first born among many brethren* ; and in another place he is called *the first born from among the dead*, that in all things he might be *πρωτεύων* the first. Some have alledged that the terms *begotten*, and *created*, are convertible terms ; and indeed the Scriptures apply the term *sons* to *creatures*, as when we read of the morning stars signing together, and the sons of God shouting for joy. But however near the terms may agree in their import, when generation or sonship relates to bringing into existence ; yet
there

there is a manifest difference between the creation or primitive sonship of the most exalted creature, and the sonship of Christ. The most noble creature that exists, can only be considered as being created or generated, by the mediation of Jesus Christ; for God created all things by him; but Jesus Christ himself was generated or brought into being by the immediate agency of the Father, and therefore he is with propriety called his only begotten Son. He is therefore distinguished from every other being, by an *ineffable generation*, *proper* and *peculiar* to himself alone. Neither is this ineffable generation, and priority that he hath before all creatures, the only characteristics by which he is distinguished from creatures; the Scriptures inform us also, that he has such capacities and endowments, as prove him not only to be above the most noble created existence; but inconceivably above all creature perfection and excellency, that doth or possibly can exist. The following texts do clearly shew this, Prov. viii. 22. "Jehovah possessed me the beginning of his ways before his works of old." Col. i. 19. "It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell." Col. ii. 9. "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily." Col. i. 15. "He is the image of the invisible God." Heb. i. 3. "The express image of his person and the brightness of his glory." John iii. 34. "God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." To be a receptacle of the divine fulness, and to receive the Spirit without measure, requires unlimited capacity; therefore the being and
perfections

perfections of the Son of God appear to be infinite in relation to creatures, as was before noticed.

But as all these inconceivable perfections, as they subsist in the person of the Son, subsist in a begotten, and consequently a derived, or originated person ; they might by the will and power of the Father, be diminished, when that diminution should be subservient to accomplish the council of peace agreed to between the Father and the Son. To this diminution or humiliation, the Son of God did cheerfully submit, for he took delight to do the will of his Father, and could sing of his power. Psal. lix. 16. Compare Isa. l. 7. In order therefore to fulfil the Father's will, and accomplish the recovery of lost sinners, he assumed the body prepared for him ; for as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. Heb. ii. 14. And, who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared : Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered. Heb. v. 7, 8.

This change in the person of the Son of God, from the form of God to the form of a servant, was effected by a secondary generation, when he was united with flesh in the womb of the Virgin Mary ; and this generation was also of an extraordinary nature, being effected by the power of the Highest, without the ordinary means of human generation. Yet,
all

all the essentials of human generation were thereby effected ; for as by human generation, a rational intelligent spiritual being is united unto flesh and blood ; and by that union, made capable of happiness or misery from the impressions of pleasure or pain, by means of material objects affecting the senses, and hath the mode of its existence changed from what it was before that union took place, and will be after it is dissolved ; so by the generation of the Son of God in the womb of the Virgin, he was united to flesh and blood, and by that union, made capable of sufferings and death from outward and material agents ; and the mode of his existence was thereby changed from what it was before his incarnation, and from what it hath been since his glorification, and will continue to be without end.

This scriptural account of the Son of God, presents to our view, a real and proper humiliation to which he submitted, which demonstrates his real and genuine love to the works of his hand ; and it also removes the difficulties which press upon the other schemes while it gives a clear sense and important signification to several Scripture passages, which otherwise are quite obscure and insignificant. What amazing humiliation ! that he who was the Ancient of days, whose goings forth had been before the days of the most ancient age, should become an infant ; that he who made all things, and appeared in the form of God, should be made flesh, even in the likeness of sinful flesh ; and that he who was rich, having all the treasures of wisdom
and

and knowledge, should lay aside the glory he had with the Father before the world was, empty himself and become poor. And how wonderful that love which drew him from the bosom of the Father, to be united with outward material nature, that he might be diminished a little more than the angels; or, as the words might be read, Psal. viii. 5. made for a little while to stand in need of the angels. Agreeable to which, the Scriptures inform us, that on some occasions the angels ministered unto him. And further, as was hinted, when things are thus viewed, sundry texts will appear to have a clear and important signification, which otherwise appear obscure and insignificant, such as these: * “What and if ye
 “shall see the Son of man ascend up where
 “he was before. † I am come forth from
 “the Father, and am come into the world;
 “again I leave the world and go unto the
 “Father. ‡ I am the bread of life which
 “came down from heaven. || In that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended, first into the lower parts of the earth:
 “He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all heavens, that he might
 “fill all things.” Thus we have in the person of Christ, the only begotten Son of God, a true and proper Mediator between God and men, a middle One between infinite and finite being, a high Priest, who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and who is able to save unto the uttermost, all that come unto God by him.

S E C T.

* John vi. 62 † John xvi. 28. ‡ John vi. 51.
 || Eph. iv. 9, 10.

S E C T. III.

Of Objections against what is said of the Holy Spirit.

I. It will perhaps be objected, that to deny proper personality to the Holy Spirit, contradicts many passages of Scripture which ascribe personal names and actions to the Holy Spirit.

Answer I. With respect to names, it is generally alledged that the names Jehovah, Lord, and God, are applied to the Holy Spirit; and some texts brought to support it, such as Ezek. viii. 1, 3. Acts v. 3, 4. The first of these, *viz.* Ezek. viii. 1, 3. is very unfavourable to the objection; for it is said, “the hand of the “Lord God,” or rather indeed, “the hand “of the Lord Jehovah fell there upon me.— “And he put forth the form of a hand and “took me by a lock of mine head, and the “Spirit lift me up.” From whence it is inferred, that he who is called Jehovah in the first verse, is called the Spirit in the third. Now allowing this inference to be just; it necessarily supposes, the Lord Jehovah, and the Spirit to be one individual being or person. And indeed the name *Spirit*, is applied both to the Father and the Son; for its said of the Father, *God is a Spirit*, and the Son is said to be *made a quickening Spirit*. This text does not however ascribe the act of taking hold of the prophet’s lock, immediately to Jehovah; for it is said, he put forth the form of a hand and took him, &c. Now it is very plain, that a hand when applied to Jehovah is an emblem of power. The text seems therefore a very direct

direct proof, that the hand or power of Jehovah, and the Spirit, signify the same thing. Agreeable to which, in the New Testament, the finger of God, the power of God, and the Spirit of God, are used as terms or names of the same signification; where Christ is said to work miracles by the Spirit or power of God, and to cast out devils by the finger of God. In the other text, Acts v. 3, 4. it is said "why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost,—thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." From this it is argued, that the Holy Spirit is called God; because lying unto the Holy Spirit is said to be a lying unto God. According to this form of arguing, the Apostles, whom our Lord sent forth to preach, were called himself; for it is said, Matth. x. 40. "He that receiveth you, receiveth me." Receiving them is here as expressly called a receiving of Christ, as lying unto the Holy Spirit is called a lying unto God. Many instances of this kind of expression might be given; but this may suffice at present.

When we consider the Holy Spirit, as that divine influence or energy, communicated to the Apostles from God the Father through Jesus Christ, by which they were inspired and enabled to declare truth, and detect falsehood; it is of the same import whether it be said to be done by the Spirit of God, or God himself. As it is of the same import whether it be said the light of the sun is darkened, or the sun himself is darkened; or that any thing is warmed by the heat of the sun, or warmed by the sun

himself. Lying unto God, and lying unto the Holy Spirit, are therefore terms of the same import ; since the Holy Spirit is no other than the energy or influence of the Father manifested through Jesus Christ, as it operates upon creatures in a diversity of gifts.

But it will perhaps be urged further, that personal pronouns, and personal actions, are expressly applied to the Spirit in Scripture, as John xvi. 13.—“ He shall not speak of himself.” Acts x. 19, 20. “ While Peter “ thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto “ him, Behold, three men seek thee. Arise “ therefore and get thee down, and go with “ them, doubting nothing ; for I have sent “ them.” Acts xiii. 2. “ The Holy Spirit said, “ separate me Barnabas and Saul.”

In answer to this, it may be observed, that though personal names or pronouns are sometimes applied to the Spirit ; yet the Holy Spirit is most frequently expressed by impersonal names or neuter pronouns. The very name Holy Spirit, is in the original always expressed impersonally, or in what is called the neuter gender. And where the pronoun *he* occurs in the English translation, it is often *it* in the original. I would not rest the answer on these neuter names and pronouns being applied to the Spirit ; but if there be any force in personal names to prove personality, there must be equal force in impersonal ones, to disprove it. But though there were no such counterbalance to oppose to what is objected, it would not amount to a proof of personality : For we find expressions every way as expressive of personality

sonality applied to impersonal things, in sundry passages of Scripture ; such as, Psal. xix. 5, 6. " He (the sun) rejoiceth as a strong man to " run a race ; his going forth," &c. Isa. xxiii. 4.—" The sea hath spoken, even the strength " of the sea, saying, I travail not." Job xxviii. 14, 22. " The depth saith, It is not in me ; " and the sea saith, It is not with me. De- " struction and death, say, We have heard the " fame thereof with our ears." These texts express names and actions, as expressive of personality as any that are applied to the Holy Spirit in Scripture ; if therefore the Scriptures are allowed to be their own interpreters, personality cannot be proved from these expressions, or such as these, simply considered.

2. It will perhaps be objected, That as believers are to be baptized in the name of the Holy Spirit, as well as that of the Father and the Son, proper personality must belong to the Holy Spirit as well as to the Father and the Son.

Answer, This inference cannot be viewed as certain and conclusive, unless the name of the Holy Spirit can be proved to imply personality ; which it appears cannot, as has been observed.

To be baptized *in*, or (as the original word *εἰς* more properly signifies) *into* the name of the Father the Son and the Holy Spirit ; seems to denote a being immersed as it were, into a profession of what we are taught in the word of God, to believe concerning the Father the Son and the Holy Spirit. The word rendered *baptized*, is from a word which signifies to

dip, plunge, or immerse, and has much the same signification.

The baptism of believers, represents their passing through the death of sin into the life of holiness; for they are said to be baptized into the death of Christ, and buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so they also might walk in newness of life. This passage from death into life can only be carried on and completed by the joint working of the Father and the Son operating in the heart by a holy energy, or divine influence, called the Holy Spirit. And hence the Father and the Son coming unto and making their abode with believers, is the same with the Holy Spirit dwelling with, and remaining in their hearts. It therefore appears every way proper, that a belief of this mediatory influence, or energy which proceeds from the Father and the Son, should be professed at baptism, though such a profession be no proof that the Holy Spirit is a proper person distinct from the Father and the Son.

But it will perhaps be said, that the expression *in the name*, signifies *by the authority*, and whatever possesses authority behoves to have proper personality.

With respect to the expression *in the name*, it has been already shown, that the word *εις* here used, is not the same with that which denotes *by* as well as *in*, see p. 55. So that the words *εις το ονομα* *into the name*, do not properly signify *by the authority*, though in an indirect way authority may be implied. As a person

son or thing may generally be supposed to be under the authority of, or belong to the person whose name is put upon him or it.

But it will not hold good, that whatever possesses authority, behoves to have proper personality. It is plain, that in our own language, authority is applied to sundry impersonal things; as a court, the church, and the state. These indeed may be resolved into persons. But it is also applied to the law, and to a commission. We find even lordship or dominion ascribed to the law; for know ye not, says the Apostle Paul, Rom. vii. 1. "That the law hath dominion over a man, &c." It will perhaps be said, that the authority of the law, is no other than the authority of God; his law being a manifestation of his authority, and of what he requires; and therefore no personality can from thence be inferred to belong to the law. This is certainly all very true; and may it not be said likewise, the authority of the Holy Spirit is no other than the authority of the Father and the Son? the Holy Spirit being only the energy of the Father and the Son, by which the existence, authority, perfections and will of the Father, as in Christ reconciling the world to himself, are made known to us by the revelation contained in the Scriptures of the Prophets and Apostles, who spake by the Spirit, and by the effects which continue to be produced by the same Spirit, in the world and in the hearts of men; therefore, no proper personality can be inferred from thence to belong to the Holy Spirit.

H E A D V.

A Summary of the Doctrine that is opposed to the foregoing Inferences. With an Enquiry into the Consequences that appear natively to flow therefrom.

THE doctrine of which a summary is here intended, is generally called the Athenasian, or orthodox doctrine of the Trinity; the sum of which seems to be this: "That in the
 "unity of the Godhead (or Supreme Essence,)
 "there be three persons of one substance,
 "power and eternity, who are denominated
 "God the Father, God the Son, and God
 "the Holy Ghost *. That each of these persons are distinguished by a peculiar personal
 "property; it being the personal property of
 "the Father to beget the Son, the personal
 "property of the Son to be begotten of the
 "Father, and the personal property of the
 "Holy Ghost to proceed from the Father and
 "the Son †. That the Son being very and
 "eternal God, of one substance and equal
 "to the Father, did, in the fulness of time,
 "take upon him man's nature ‡, a true body
 "and a reasonable soul ||; endured most grievous
 "torments in his soul, and painful sufferings
 "in his body, was crucified and died §." This seems to be the sum of the doctrine, and the consequences appear to be as follow: 1. It divides the one Supreme Being or Essence.

2. It

* Westminster Conf. ch. 2. sect. 3.

† Larger Catch. q. 9, 10.

‡ Westminster Conf. ch. 8. sect. 2.

|| Lar. Cat. q. 37. § Westminster Conf. ch. 8. sect. 4.

2. It ascribes to one part of the indivisible and immutable Essence, a property or properties which the others do not possess. 3. It ascribes two natures to the person of Christ, each of which separately considered, possesses all the properties necessary to constitute personality. 4. It ascribes all acts and sufferings to the human nature that can be ascribed to the Mediator.

First, That this doctrine divides the one Supreme Being, appears from the following particulars. 1. It mentions three distinct persons, who have all one common essence. Now, it is evident, that each distinct person must possess either a part or the whole of this essence; if one person possesses the whole, there will be none for the rest, and if each distinct person has a part of this essence; or, which is the same, if each distinct person has a proper distinct being or essence, then the one essence or being must be as much divided as the persons. But 2. There are different and distinct actions ascribed to these persons. As for instance, the Father is said to beget, and the Son to be begotten. Now, if the person of the Father includes the whole essence, and the person of the Son includes the whole essence also; then the whole essence was begetting in the person of the Father; while, at the same instant, the same individual essence was begotten in the person of the Son. Again, a covenant is said to have been entered into between the Father and the Son before the world began; and in this case also, the whole essence proposes a covenant in the person of the Father, and, at the same time, accepts it in the person of the Son

Son. These are certainly as gross contradictions as can be conceived. Nor will the maintainers of this doctrine find any advantage, by saying these acts are the acts of the persons, and not of the essence; for, to ascribe actions to persons abstracted from essence or being, is to ascribe actions to persons that have no essence or being at all. A person must either be or not be; or which is the same thing, have a being or essence, or have no being or essence. Every one that seriously reflects, must certainly know, that the idea of a person must necessarily include the idea of the essence or being of that person. This doctrine must therefore divide the one Supreme Essence as distinctly in three parts, as it holds that three distinct persons exist, who have no other essence but this among them. These persons being supposed to be all equal, each one behoves to have a third of the whole, which is truly and properly the essence of each respective person, and lays a foundation for the distinct actions that are ascribed to each.

The supporters of this scheme are in general very reserved, as to letting it be known what they mean by personal distinction, or what idea that distinction conveys to themselves. It has been said by some, "That each person is "a distinct intelligent agent." By others, "That a person in the God-head is a complete "intelligent, and individual substance."

Now, it might be asked, Whether they suppose that each person is infinite, or that three persons make but one infinite? If they suppose each person to be infinite, then they must suppose

pose there are three infinite intelligent agents, or individual substances. Whereas it appears to be a self-evident truth, that there can be but one infinite supreme intelligence ; for the idea of infinite being or substance, must exclude all others of the same kind. And if they suppose each person separately considered, to be finite ; then they must suppose one infinite, to be made up of three finite intelligences. How absurd then is this doctrine in this single point of view ; and how much more so, could all its absurdities be properly exposed ?

Second, Another consequence of this doctrine is, that it ascribes to one part of the Divine Essence, a property or properties, which the others do not possess ; or affirms and denies that such properties belong thereunto at the same time.

It has been observed, that this doctrine doth necessarily imply a division of the Supreme Essence, if every person has a distinct essence corresponding with distinct personality. If this is allowed, it follows of consequence, that the property of being unbegotten belongs to that part of the essence which is proper to the Father ; and the property of being begotten to that which is proper to the Son ; and the property of proceeding, to that which is proper to the Holy Spirit. And, if on the other hand, it is held that each person includes the whole Divine Essence ; then the whole essence must be supposed to be active and passive at the same time, the whole being generating in the person of the Father, while the same individual whole

is

is generated in the person of the Son, &c. as before noticed.

It is an unmeaning unintelligible distinction, to say that personal properties and acts, are not the properties of the essence, but of the persons in the essence. For, as has also been noticed, to speak of a person abstracted from essence, is to speak of a person that hath no essence, that is no being at all. But further, if the personal properties are not the properties of the essence ; then they are not essential properties. Consequently the Divine Essence might have existed without these properties, and so without personality. How evidently then does this doctrine destroy the foundation of its own existence, when its consequences are a little attended unto ? It being evident, that the doctrine cannot be maintained without denying that the personal properties contended for, are essential properties ; and if they are not essential, it will surely be a hard task to prove that they are eternal as the Divine Essence is eternal ; for what-ever disproves the one, seems clearly to disprove the other.

Supposing, however, that these personal properties may be, without being the properties of the essence ; let us see how these properties will consist with that equality of persons, that is contended for by the defenders of this doctrine. They hold that it is the exclusive property of the Father to beget the Son, of the Father and the Son to send the Holy Spirit ; according to which the Spirit wants two properties that the Father hath, namely that of begetting and sending. And the Son also hath
two

two properties which the Holy Spirit wants, namely, that of being begotten and that of sending. And the Father likewise wants two properties which the Son and the Holy Spirit have, namely, the properties of being begotten and proceeding or being sent. Is it possible for any one indued with the exercise of reason, to conclude that such different properties can consist with the equality of the persons to whom they belong as distinguishing and exclusive properties? But we shall perhaps be told that reason has nothing to do in this matter. Let us hear then what the Scriptures say of such properties, relative to equality, Mal. i. 6. "A son honour-
 "eth (Heb. כבוד should honour) his father." Agreeable to which our Lord says, John viii. 49. "I honour my Father." From these texts we see that Father-hood hath a dignity and supremacy above sonship, which lays a foundation for honour and obedience from a Son. We find also him that is sent, put in the same rank of subordination to him that sent him; as a servant is to his Lord, John xiii. 16. "The
 "servant is not greater than his lord, neither
 "he that is sent, greater than he that sent him." Thus Scripture testimony concurs with reason to shew the absurdity of supposing equality consistent with the properties that the supporters of this doctrine allow to belong to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. And indeed there is scarce any thing more clearly pointed out to us in Scripture, than the subordination of the Son to the Father; for besides our Lord's own express declaration, "My Father is greater
 "than I," he is called both a Son and a Ser-
 vant,

vant, and has declared that the Father taught him and sent him into the world. And as if he had particularly fore-seen, and provided against this doctrine of equality and the most subtil arguments by which it is defended; as when they tell us that all these subordinate characters, are peculiar to the mediatory dispensation; he hath plainly revealed, that when the mediatory kingdom shall be delivered up, all things being subdued; that then the Son also himself shall be subject to the Father, that God may be all in all. See 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28.

Third, This doctrine called orthodox, ascribes two natures to Christ since the incarnation, each of which, separately considered, have all the properties that are necessary to constitute personality.

This consequence is also very evident; for a complete person is said to take a true body and a reasonable soul. Now, every one almost who knows any thing, must know, that a true body and a reasonable soul is a complete person. There must therefore, not only be an union of natures, but also an union of persons according to this doctrine; so that according to it, the Lord Jesus Christ consists of two persons, or else two persons are one person, or united in one. There are several unions spoken of in Scripture, and also in common conversation, besides personal union; and some other term might perhaps have been more properly used by the maintainers of this doctrine than personal union. For so far as we can judge from the union of matter and spirit, or personal
union

union implies a reciprocal influence of the one upon the other. Therefore the term *personal union* when applied to the divine and human natures, would natively lead persons to think that the divine nature suffered by being personally united with the human. It would seem, that some of the most eminent writers on that side of the question, had been led into this opinion; I shall only at present instance Thomas Brooks, who in his *Golden Key, Glasgow printed, p. 131*, says, "That which Christ assumed or took of our nature, he assumed for this end, that he might suffer in it. Do not these words natively imply, that the divine nature suffered. He seems more positive still afterwards; for in proving that Christ suffered in more than his body, he says, p. 136, "Christ gave himself for us, Tit. ii. 14. (but, says he,) "his body is not himself." Now, if because the expression *himself*, includes more than his body; namely his soul; so also because the expression *himself* includes more than soul and body, therefore he suffered in more than his soul and body, namely in his divine nature. This author deservedly bears a very respectable character, as a writer; but we may from this see, what absurd expressions, if not absurd sentiments, good men may be led into, by embracing self-contradictory doctrines.

It is not likely, however, that any will venture plainly to affirm, that the divine nature is capable of sufferings, since passion or suffering is inconsistent with the perfection and immutability, that necessarily belongs to that nature or essence. But if any will venture to suppose,

H that

that the divine nature of Christ suffered ; and at the same time, hold that this divine nature is the same with the nature or essence of the Father ; they must either suppose that the divine nature which is common to the Father and the Son, is so divisible as that one part of it may suffer in the person of the Son, while another is free of suffering in the person of the Father ; or else that the whole essence may suffer in the person of the Son, while the whole of the same essence is free of suffering in the person of the Father. These consequences are too native to be avoided, and too gross to be admitted ; and therefore every thing that implies passiveness or suffering, is applied to the human nature. Which leads to another consequence of this doctrine.

Fourth, That it ascribes all the acts and sufferings to the human nature, that can be ascribed to the Mediator.

Some of the most learned defenders of this doctrine, in order to account for that of our Lord's praying to the Father, and receiving instruction from him ; and for his receiving the Spirit from the Father in an unmeasurable degree ; by which he delivered his sublime doctrine, and performed miraculous works ; in order to account for these things, they say that his divine nature was *quiescent* or *at rest*. This just brings in that gross absurdity so often noticed, that one thing is ascribed to one part of the divine nature, and another thing to another part of that nature ; for this is the same as to say that the divine nature in part or whole, was quiescent or inactive in the person
of

of the Son, while the same nature in part or whole was active in the person of the Father and Holy Spirit. But, passing this, it appears very evident, that what is called a personal union between the divine and human natures, cannot be supposed to make the divine nature limited in any perfection, or capable of any passion or sufferings. Nor that it raised the human nature to the same perfections with the divine. The two natures therefore remained quite distinct in their volitions and actions. They must therefore say, according to their plan, that as man or mediator, Christ was born into the world; as man or mediator, he was anointed with the Holy Spirit; as man or mediator, he knew not the day of judgment; as man or mediator, he spake to the world those things which he heard of the Father; as man or mediator, he made supplication to the Father with strong crying and tears; as man or mediator, he suffered and died; as man or mediator, the Father raised him from the dead; as man or mediator, the Father set him at his own right hand; and as man or mediator, he is appointed Judge of the quick. Thus all mediatory acts are assigned to the human nature. And indeed it cannot be conceived that the divine nature can have any share in mediation; for if it hath, it must mediate between creatures and itself, which is a contradiction in terms; or else it must be divided, so as one part of it may mediate between creatures, and the other part or parts. All which is too grossly absurd to be admitted. It therefore appears evident, that this doctrine makes

the Lord Jesus Christ no more than a human saviour ; and however much it may be extolled for orthodoxy ; or however severely its favourers may declaim against Socinianism, as a most dangerous, or perhaps, in their opinion, a damnable doctrine ; yet when theirs is examined, and striped of some unmeaning phrases, it in every respect makes Jesus Christ as much a human saviour, as that of the Socinians doth. And since both these appear to be quite inconsistent with Scripture-revelation, the following may next be considered :

H E A D VI.

A short summary of the Scripture-doctrine, relative to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit ; with an enquiry into the uses of information, admonition and comfort, that may be deduced therefrom.

THIS doctrine may be summed up thus : There is one God the Father, of whom are all things, whose being or essence is invisible ; and whose glory and perfections, are infinite and immutable. And there is one mediator between God and men, the Lord Jesus Christ, by whom God created all things ; who was brought forth as the image of the invisible God, before any creature was made ; who was anointed and possessed of Jehovah, and subsisted in the nearest union with the invisible God the Father from the beginning, that can possibly subsist between a begotten and unbegotten being ; whose goings forth as the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person, have been before the
days

days of the most ancient age ; who was with God in the beginning, as his word by whom he spake creatures into existence, and made known his will, for their direction and comfort ; through whom an enlivening light is diffused unto every man that cometh into the world ; who was made flesh, being personally united thereunto in the womb of the Virgin, as the children of men are by ordinary generation, that in the body there prepared, he might experience the infirmities of human nature, suffer and die ; who rose again from the dead, ascended up where he was before, and was repossessed of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was ; and who ever hath been, and will continue to be the fulfiller of the Father's will, in destroying the works of the devil, till every plant which his heavenly Father hath not planted be rooted up, the enmity destroyed, all things reconciled, and the Father's purpose of gathering all things together in him, be fully accomplished. And there is also one Spirit, with which the Son of God was anointed, and which rested upon him ; under the designations of the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and of might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. By which believers are also anointed, and which abides with them, as a Spirit of adoption, Spirit of truth, Spirit of faith, and Spirit of holiness ; by which all divine operations relative to creatures in general, and believers in particular, are carried into effect ; and all the variety of gifts conferred, ordinary and extraordinary,

that any of mankind are favoured with. And as the design and tendency of all the gifts of the Spirit of God, is to produce holiness, and carry it to perfection; this divine energy is most frequently called the Holy Spirit.

None of the consequences that have been observed to flow from the other doctrine, can, in any respect, be charged upon this, being scriptural, it is every way consistent; for it supports the infinite being, glory and perfections of the one supreme immutable God, and the unity and indivisibility of his essence. It also gives a clear, consistent and uniform view of the one Mediator between God and men, exhibits an inconceivable glory in his person, as the immediate offspring of the invisible God, and the express image of his person; and points him out as a real proper person, who, both in his pre-incarnate and incarnate state, has capacities proper and peculiar to himself alone, which fits him to bear the characters of Jesus Christ, or the Anointed Saviour, and to perform every act of mediation between God and men, and be the medium of intercourse between infinite and finite nature. The Holy Spirit also is here held forth, as that by which all divine purposes are carried into effect, being the joint influence of the Father and the Son, or powerful energy exerted through Christ Jesus the one Mediator, whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself.

A few uses may now be added, which appear to be native from this doctrine.

I. *Of Information.*

1. WE may hence be informed, that there is one Supreme Being, in whom all religious worship, yea all honour and worship of any kind should terminate. For if we honour church-officers, it ought to be for their works sake; or, because they are workers under God, and employed by him for promoting the good of his church. If we honour civil rulers, it ought to be because they are God's ministers, appointed by him for the punishment of evil doers, and the praise of them that do well. And when we honour and worship the Lord Jesus Christ as the creator, preserver and governor of the universe, he is still to be considered as sustaining all these high characters by the will and appointment of the Father, to whom he is the way of access, and in whom, through him as the alone Mediator, all honour and worship should ultimately terminate. All this seems to be very clearly intimated to us in that short sentence delivered by our Lord to his disciples, Matt. 10. xl. "He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me." Even those who contend for the equality of the Father and the Son, when they come to speak of what is practical, they allow that worship terminates in the Father as the chief object. Some of them express themselves thus: "We are to worship the Father in Christ the Son by the Spirit; and thus when we pray, we are to ask the Father in the name of the Son by the Holy Spirit."

2. This

2. This doctrine informs us, that the Messiah, the Christ, or the Anointed, who is the only begotten Son of God; subsisted as a proper distinct person, which necessarily implies his having a distinct nature or essence from the Father's essence, in which his personal properties subsist distinct from the personal properties of the Father, before the world began; and was endowed in his personal constitution, with capacities to receive the fulness of the glory and perfections of the infinite and immutable essence, and to manifest these perfections in the creation, preservation and government of finite beings.

This proper personal distinction between the Father and the Son, lays a proper foundation for a covenant-transaction between them; or, for the Son to accept the execution of the Father's gracious purpose relative to creatures, according to the council of peace between them both. And also for the humiliation and real diminution of the glory of the Son of God, and for his praying to his heavenly Father when in a state of humiliation and poverty. The perfect knowledge that the Son had of the Father, as immutable truth, pure goodness, and disinterested love, laid a foundation for the most firm confidence and absolute resignation. Among the many promises that seem to relate to the Son of God in his humiliation state, that in Psal. xci. 15. seems to be very comprehensive; it is this: "I will be with him in trouble, I will deliver him and honour him." In the confidence of this promise, and such as this, we find he exults;

exults ; and, with confidence, encounters a suffering state, Isa. l. 6, 7, 8. " I gave my back " to the smiters, and my cheeks to them " that plucked off the hair, I hid not my face " from shame and spitting ; For the Lord " God will help me, therefore shall I not " be confounded ; therefore have I set my " face like a flint, and I know that I shall not " be ashamed. He is near that justifieth me ; " who will contend with me ? "

In this view of the matter, we may also see, that the very same person who covenanted, did also accomplish the thing covenanted to, by being united with, or partaking of flesh and blood as the children of men partake of the same ; that is, by being personally united thereto, he felt the infirmities of our nature in its present state, passed through all the painful and dark stages of death, that appear so dreadful to flesh and blood, and often fill the mind with horror : That by his resurrection from the dead, and shewing his conquest over death, his followers might be quickened unto a lively hope, and have their minds so fortified as to encounter death in its most dreadful forms without fear. And not only so, but also by appearing in our nature, he brought divine goodness, kindness and love to the nearest and plainest view of mankind, that by the manifestation of these in the human nature, they might know what they were in the divine ; for when our Lord says, he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father ; it certainly is as much, nay more, than if he had said, he that seeth my love to mankind seeth the Father's also.

3. This

3. This doctrine points out to us a steady and uniform object of worship ; the mind, according to this doctrine, is not kept in a constant change from three to one, and one to three ; but has one infinite and absolutely perfect, invisible being presented to it ; whose being and perfections are manifested by the being and perfections of the anointed Saviour, the one Mediator, who is the way, the truth and the life, the only way of access to the Father. And shews, at the same time, that a capacity to apprehend, and a disposition to love, and worship the invisible God thus manifested, as the fountain of all perfection and blessedness ; must be effected by the Holy Spirit, or that mediatory energy or influence, that is shed forth by Jesus Christ from his holy Father ; by which, he, as the true light and quickening Spirit, enlightens the mind to discover the divine glory and perfections that shine forth in himself as the image of the invisible God ; and kindle in the heart that flame of divine love, that all the terror of creature opposition, and allurements of creature enjoyments, will never be able to extinguish ; if the means that he hath appointed for maintaining and promoting it, be duly attended to.

II. *Of Admonition.*

1. Since the Scriptures so clearly shew that there is one God the Father, of whom are all things ; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things : Or, in other words, that there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself

a ransom for all; it concerns every one to be admonished from thence, to beware when they speak of the Most High, and not affirm any plurality in him, that his own word instead of supporting, appears evidently to contradict. The unity of the divine Being is very particularly pointed out to us, Gal. iii. 20. Where God is not only said to be distinct from the Mediator, but it is also said, that God is one. The words are, "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one." Now the question may be asked, What does *one* refer to? That God is one being or essence, is generally allowed; and it is certainly true that he is one, and can be but one being; but several deny that God is one person. Let us therefore try whether essence, or person would be the most suitable supplement; that is, whether the text means that God is one essence or one person? The Apostle had been just speaking of a mediator, and from thence inferred, that there behoved to be persons mediated between; for says he, ὁ δὲ μεσότης ἑνός οὐκ ἐστίν, *but a mediator is not of one.* A mediator as necessarily implies two parties besides himself, as a middle term necessarily implies two extremes. If we say the Lord Jesus Christ is a Mediator between persons, the essence of the persons will be necessarily included in the idea of the persons. But if we say he mediates between beings or essences abstracted from personality, it will be a very unscriptural and unintelligible mediation. Since therefore mediation respects persons, and the persons on the one hand are many, and on the other but one,

is it not most plain and native, that the Apostle calls God one person, in opposition to mankind, who are many persons? for it is between God and men that Christ is the one Mediator. The text seems therefore, to contain an affirmation that God is one person, agreeable to the general tenor of Scripture-revelation, and the dictates of common sense.

2. Since the uniform language of Scripture shews, that the Son is not equal in power and glory in every respect with the Father, such as enjoy the Scriptures, and profess to believe that they are the word of God, and yet reject the plain testimony therein given, ought to consider how far they may one day be exposed to shame, for preferring the testimony of men, to that testimony. The dignified titles or epithets, of orthodoxy will be of small avail, when every man's work shall be tried by fire; for that which is highly esteemed among men, is (at least sometimes) an abomination in the sight of God.

By a little serious consideration, the doctrine now called orthodox, and the Scripture-doctrine will appear expressly contrary to one another; for, says the orthodox-doctrine, (falsely so called,) God is three persons; the Scripture says God is one. The defenders of modern orthodoxy say, the Son is equal with the Father; our Lord says, my Father is greater than I. How astonishing is it than, vain mortals who are of yesterday, and know nothing, should have the presumption to oppose the testimony of their Maker? Can any testimony be more directly opposed, than the testimony
of

of the Most High in his word, and by his only begotten Son? When he says in his word, God is one; they say nay, God is three. The Son himself says, my Father is greater than I; nay, say they, the Son is equal with the Father. Doth not such a conduct, look more like a rebelling against the words of the Most High, than a trembling at his word? And may not our Lord say, They have given the lie both to me and my Father?

It is hardly possible, that any man would have ventured on so direct an opposition to so clear a testimony, given by so indisputable authority, till it was involved in almost impenetrable darkness, by the perverse disputings of men; who, having shut their eyes and ears against the simple language and light of divine revelation, and kindled up a spark of their own in its stead. But let every one take heed how they walk in the light of a fire that men have kindled; for, however they may please themselves with the entertainment it gives them for a time; they will at last find, that they have made choice of a false guide.

It is surely the duty of all to fear before him, before whom the nations are as a drop of the bucket, and by whom they are counted as the small dust of the balance. And to reverence his word, which he hath sent forth, for the gracious purpose of healing diseased souls; by removing their darkness, and presenting to their view his inconceivably glorious and amiable perfections, and the engaging manner of their manifestation; and by disclosing the boundless resources that he hath

in reserve for overcoming their corruption, purifying and exalting their nature, and making them fit for an incorruptable inheritance, even heirs of himself, and joint heirs with Christ. But which word, will prove a hammer and a fire, to break in pieces and consume those who stumble at what it reveals, and will be even the favour of death to those who reject the doctrine of life which it contains. With what reverence and attention then should the word of God be read? And instead of contradicting, adding to, or diminishing from, any part of its testimony; it ought to be received with the greatest readiness of mind, believed with the most firm confidence, and revered as the word of him, whose word brought the whole system of created nature into existence; upholds it in being, and has doomed to perdition, whatever opposes what this word enjoins. It may, therefore, be hoped, that it will not be reckoned presumptuous or unfriendly, to repeat an admonition which stands supported by an authority not to be disputed; the admonition is this, "Add thou not unto his word, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." To which may be added, another of no less authority, and expressed in a more rousing manner: Where the faithful and true Witness, the Prince of the kings of the earth, who hath the keys of hell and of death, says, "I testify to every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man

“ man shall take away from the words of the
 “ book of this prophecy, God shall take away
 “ his part out of the book of life,” &c.

Let, therefore, the maintainers and promoters of human systems, which cannot be maintained without adding to, or diminishing from the simple truth as it stands in the divine record ; seriously ponder these things, and renounce whatever is inconsistent with the divine testimony, as they would wish not to be found false witnesses for God.

III. *Of Comfort.*

1. A DISCOVERY of the early outgoings of the divine goodness, must afford a very comfortable reflection ; and this is most clearly and fully discovered from the Scripture account of the early constitution of the Mediator's person, as the medium of intercourse and communication between infinite and finite, uncreated and created nature, while creatures continued innocent ; and in appointing him to enter upon, and exercise the offices of an atoning and reconciling Mediator, whenever sin commenced. Some have remarked, and that justly, that the goodness of God shines forth, in that a full provision was made of every thing that might contribute to the happiness of man in his outward state, before he was created and placed in this world ; so that upon his casting his eyes around him, he might see that he was placed in a well furnished world. But how much more does the goodness of God shine forth in the provision that he hath made for intellectual beings, in the person of Christ ;

in whom it pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell, and that all the riches of wisdom and knowledge should be treasured up in him, before any created intelligent was brought into being; that in him they might behold the glory of the invisible God; he being the express image of his person and the brightness of his glory. That by their immediate intercourse with him, and his spirit upon them, they might feel their happiness, and get discoveries of unbounded goodness, to be disclosed in the most ravishing beauties, for their enjoyment, to the full satisfaction of their utmost desires, through the boundless ages of endless duration.

2. A consideration, that there was not only a provision made for giving the highest felicity to intelligent creatures, while they continued in innocence; but also a provision made for their recovery, when by sin they had brought ruin upon themselves, and were sinking in the horrible pit of destruction. A consideration of this, must natively present to the mind a most comfortable reflection, and fill the soul with joy and peace in believing the divine testimony concerning the early and ample provision that was made for their salvation, by Jesus Christ, or the anointed Saviour, from these destructions they had brought upon themselves. The revelation of this provision is given in such a way in the gospel; (or good news, which God hath been pleased in his condescending love, to intimate to mankind sinners;) as is every way suited to increase their comfort, confirm their faith, and heighten their joy;
and

and excite all the power of their souls to bless his name, and express their love to him who first loved them. Must it not greatly increase the comfort of every individual, to know that **God** so far concerned himself about their happiness, that to recover them from the effects of their apostasy from himself, he entered into a covenant with his only begotten Son, for their sanctification and complete redemption? And when they are assured from the word of **God**, yea, even his most solemn oath, that he hath no pleasure in the death of sinners, is not willing that any should perish, but will have all men to come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved; how greatly must a right knowledge of such gracious declarations, confirm their faith and heighten their joy, and lay a firm foundation for strong consolation, amidst all the distresses and afflictions which they are subjected in this present state of things? How happy then must they be who know the joyful sound of the glorious gospel of peace, and walk in the light of **JEHOVAH's** countenance? But the knowledge of all this, is connected with, and even depends upon the knowledge of the only true **God** and **Jesus Christ** whom he hath sent.

3. The gradual manifestation of **Jesus Christ** in his mediatory character, as the upholder of a perishing world, even in his preincarnate state, may afford a comfortable reflection; but more especially his manifestation in the flesh.

It has been alledged by some friends as well as enemies to divine revelation, that man has no capacities in this state of his existence by

which he could discover without information, that the present visible system of the universe had a beginning, or that it will have an end; it being impossible to demonstrate by any experiment within the compass of human power, that nothing may become something; or that something may become nothing. The knowledge of creation seems, therefore, to come wholly from information; and all who believe it, must believe it as a matter of faith; agreeable to this we are taught, Heb. xi. 3. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God; so that things which are seen, were not made of things which do appear*." It is by information also, even the information that we receive from divine revelation, that we know that the whole system of created nature is upheld by the same word, by which the visible creation was framed, and all the successive ages of its duration adjusted, so as to unfold the mysteries of divine providence, and manifest the wonders of redeeming love.

The revelation that God was graciously pleased to give unto mankind from time to time;
by

* This text, Heb. xi. 3. is not very literally translated, but its literal translation will not make it unfit for the purpose for which it is brought. The passage is more literal thus, *By faith we understand the ages to be adjusted by the word of God; for the being of the things that are seen (or their coming into existence,) is not from the things which appear.* This reading (which I think is very literal,) not only informs us, that our understanding things seen, not to have their being from apparent things, is from testimony; but also, that the ages of their existence, is adjusted by the same word that spake them into being.

by which he was pleased to inform them of what they ought to believe and do; he was also pleased to demonstrate to be a revelation from himself, with such certainty as might leave them no ground to doubt. This he did by the same word by whom all things were created, even the Lord Jesus Christ, by whom God created all things. And the manner in which he did this, was by the appearance of his only begotten Son, in such a way as demonstrated to their senses the certainty of his existence; who by the glorious forms in which he appeared, the declarations he gave, and power he manifested; did clearly prove, that he was the Creator and Governor of the universe, and that it was he who upheld the world and its inhabitants from sinking into perdition under the corruption that had taken place therein; as Psal. lxxv. 3. "The earth and all the inhabitants thereof, are וְיָמֵינוּ dissolving, "I myself have borne up the pillars thereof. "*Selah.*" What a comfortable reflection! that the help of sinners is laid upon such a glorious and mighty One.

But if man is incapable in this present state to discover any being beyond the system of nature, or any power above what is called its laws, without revelation; much less could any being or power be discovered by man, beyond that glorious and mighty One who demonstrated himself to be the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of the world; and to whose uncontrolled sway all nature was made to yield, unless he had given information thereof. But this he did by intimating that there

was

was one greater than he, whose messenger he only was, and to whom he stood related as a son and servant. This Scriptural view of the one Mediator, the Redeemer, and Saviour of sinners ; as the Creator, Supporter and Governor of the universe, dwelling in the Father, and the Father in him, in the closest union that possibly can subsist with a distinction of persons and agencies ; doth also demonstrate the kindness and love of God to mankind, in condescending thus to reveal to such insignificant creatures, creatures defiled by sin ; so clear a manifestation of himself, his glorious perfections, and gracious purposes, relative to the works of his hand. But all these are still more fully and intimately manifested by the incarnation of the Son of God.

Some have alledged that we cannot know the nature of God's moral perfections ; that is, his justice, goodness and truth ; from any discovery he hath made of himself to us. This need not be thought strange, from those who reject the revelation he hath given of himself in his word ; but it is very much so, from those who profess a belief of that revelation. Experience, sad experience, however, proves, that education and a habit of thinking, will reconcile the human mind to the grossest absurdities. The Scriptures do testify in the plainest and fullest manner, that God is good, that he is love, that his tender mercies are over all his works, and that there is no respect of persons with him. This Scripture character of the Most High being quite irreconcilable with the idea of a being ; who, from

a free volition of his own will, ordained a great, or rather the greatest part of his creatures, to absolute and endless misery; while, from a partial respect to some persons, he predestinated them to happiness; therefore some, rather than give up their favourite idol, are willing to alledge, that goodness, love, &c. in God, are of a different kind from these qualities or dispositions which we call goodness, love, mercy, &c. in men. This is a blow at the root, and totally destroys the foundation of all our confidence in the promises of God, and of our comfort arising therefrom; for, if it were so, then for any thing we know, it might be consistent with the truth of God never to fulfil his promises; with his goodness, to suffer evil to reign triumphant over the works of his hand without end; and with his tender mercy, to inflict the most cruel torture that infinite wisdom can contrive, and infinite power effect. But to the unspeakable comfort of all who know and believe the truth, the goodness of God shines forth with a brightness of evidence, which challenges the admiration, and humble gratitude of all the children of men; for he hath given the most plain and certain discoveries of his love, his mercy, his goodness, and all the other perfections of his nature, with which human happiness, or indeed the happiness of any of his creatures, so far as we know, is concerned, as leaves no ground to suspect that ever he will inflict an unavailing punishment on any of the works of his hand; for, since he will have a respect to the works of his

his hand, and his tender mercy is over all his works ; the hand that strikes will be always directed by the heart that loves, in all the punishment he inflicts.

In the Scriptures of truth, we have not only the names of goodness, love, mercy, truth, &c. but the import of these names are also particularly pointed out, and that so fully and plainly, that none who pay any attention to that revelation appear to be in the least difficulty about their meaning. We have the divine testimony in express terms, *He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good.*

To love mercy, walk humbly, relieve the oppressed, minister to the wants of the needy, and to fulfil every promise with the utmost exactness, are certainly characteristics of a good, merciful, loving, and truthful disposition. It is not here alledged, that the most enlightened mind can take in a perfect idea of the goodness of God, or any of his other perfections from the revelation he hath given ; nor yet that the goodness, love, &c. of those who have arrived at the highest attainments in this state, come up even to their own ideas, much less that they come up to these perfections as they are in God ; no, the disproportion is infinite. But though the disproportions be infinite as to degree, yet the nature and tendency appear to be similar.

But this matter is set in a still clearer and more certain point of view, by the incarnation of the Son of God. We are certain from what is recorded of the words which he spake, and the works which he did ; that the goodness,

ness, love, mercy and truth, which he manifested, or which appeared in him, were similar to what is so called among men; or, to those qualities and dispositions that characterize a good or perfect man, in a sense sometimes used in Scripture. And we are also certain, that the perfections of goodness, &c. which he manifested, were the perfections of the only begotten of the Father; and were therefore a true representation of these perfections as they subsist in the invisible God, whose image he was, and ever will continue to be.

The incarnation of the Son of God, or the Word's being made flesh, was a real manifestation of God in the flesh in every point of view. He who was thus incarnate, was the image of the invisible God, the God of glory who appeared unto Abraham and others under the Old Testament dispensation; and when incarnate, his glory was beheld as the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; and in this state also, he manifested forth his glory, so as to give sufficient proof that he was the Son of God, the King of Israel, and Saviour of the world. And as he ever dwelt in the Father and the Father in him; the glory of the invisible God the Father was manifested in the flesh through him. So it is said, in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Observe, it is not said in him dwells the second person of the Godhead bodily, which the scheme of doctrine opposed to this would seem to require.

Among the many absurdities that attend
the

the doctrine of a plurality of persons who have all one indivisible essence, those that attend the supposition of a covenant-transaction upon this plan, seems to be none of the least. For, let it be supposed, that the Son is the same essence with the Father ; then, being equally independent, self-sufficient, immutable and incapable of passiveness or suffering, he could no more be humbled, feel the infirmities of the human nature, suffer and die than the Father. If therefore he covenanted to be incarnate, humbled, exposed to sufferings, and actually to die ; he covenanted to what it was impossible for him to perform.

It is to no purpose to say that he fulfilled what was covenanted to, by assuming the human nature ; since, notwithstanding of what is called personal union, the divine nature was as distinct from the human nature thus united to it, as it was distinct from any other man ; and the divine nature of the second person neither felt, nor was affected with the sufferings of human nature any more than the rest of the persons in the Godhead.

To say the best of it, it certainly gives but a very low representation of the divine love or the condescension of the Son of God ; for, it is but a small matter for a person to settle difficult articles, and painful to accomplish, when the difficulty and pain cannot affect himself.

But the Scripture doctrine concerning the Son of God, gives a very different view of this matter. We are there taught, that that very same Word who was with God in the beginning, by whom all things were made ;
even

even that same Word was made flesh. That as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, even so he also himself took part of the same, that he might feel their infirmities, suffer and die. And so the very same person who entered into covenant, fulfils every thing covenanted in the strictest sense. This view of the matter also demonstrates the greatness and reality of the love of God the Father to mankind sinners, in thus sending his only begotten Son into a state of real humiliation and suffering. And no less demonstrates the love of Christ, that he should voluntarily and cheerfully undertake to expose himself to sufferings so complicated, pains so exquisite, and ignominy so inconceivably great. Wonderful condescension! demonstrating a degree of love, not to be found among the most feeling of the sons of men. And what a firm foundation is here laid, for the most solid comfort and inexpressible joy.

When his poor weary followers find themselves surrounded with difficulties, and involved in poverty and want; how comfortable and cheering must it be for them to know and reflect, that he who is their glorious Forerunner, experimentally knows, and is touched with a feeling of all their afflictions, infirmities and wants? And when they consider that he not only went through a state of sorrow, poverty and grief, but also passed into the dark regions of death, and vanquished that king of terrors in his strongest hold; how may their minds be fortified, and they encouraged to enter that gloomy shade with quietness and

serenity of mind? Since they are assured, that as certainly as their glorious Head arose and ascended in triumph, having vanquished hell and death; so certainly shall they be freed from its power, and conducted to those mansions of bliss that he hath prepared for them. How full of comfort is that short declaration of this mighty Saviour, recorded Rev. i. 17, 18. "Fear not, I am the first and the last, even he that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore. Amen. And I have the keys of hell and of death."

A view of this one Mediator between God and men, in his estate of exaltation, and reinstatement into the possession of that glory which he had with the Father before the world was, presents a no less comfortable prospect. He having ascended up far above all heavens, and being possessed of an energy whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself, there can remain no doubt but he will fully accomplish all that remains to be accomplished of his undertaking, when he hath already accomplished the most astonishing and painful part of it. And if God spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all, how much more shall he not with him also freely give us all things. When reconciliation is accomplished by his death, salvation will certainly be effected by his life. Therefore we may be fully assured, that if we are planted in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.

To conclude this head, it may be observed, that the Scripture-doctrine relative to this important subject; namely, the knowledge of the
only

only true God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, is replete with comfort, in every point of view. It exhibits the early outgoings of the love of God through his only begotten Son, the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person; and presents to our faith a glorious Captain of salvation, made perfect through sufferings, a great high Priest who can be touched with a feeling of our infirmities; even a mighty Saviour, who is able to save to the uttermost, all that come unto God by him. And this exhibition of the divine goodness, in proposing a happiness to mankind, in all respects greater than they can conceive; and in giving them all the security for their most certain enjoyment of it in the way that he hath appointed, that their nature in its present state can admit of, is every way suited to inspire the soul with the truest devotion, and most exalted piety, and to inflame the heart with seraphic love; so as to draw forth all the powers of the soul, in humble praise to God for such discoveries of boundless goodness, never-failing grace, and tender mercy, extending to all the works of his hand, through Jesus Christ his only begotten Son.



I

T

C

I

is
is
ri
re
“

th
th
fo

na
to
aff
lit
of
th
Ex

AN APPENDIX,

In which are more particularly answered, such objections as are commonly urged by some, against some things that have been advanced in the foregoing pages; from the names ALEIM and JEHOVAH, &c. And the import or signification of these names, &c. pointed out.

This Appendix being intended as a supplement to Head IV. it may be divided as follows:

SECT. I.

Concerning a Plurality in the Unity of the Supreme Essence.

1. IT is argued, that the plural form of the word אֱלֹהִים, ALEIM, commonly translated God, is a proof of this plurality. And that Deut. vi. 4. is perfectly decisive in favour of this argument, if rightly translated. The text in the English Bible reads thus: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." And from thence it is argued, that the word אֱלֹהִים, rendered *God*, is plural, and the word יְהוָה, rendered *Lord*, is singular; therefore there is a plurality in the unity of the essence.

The import or signification of these interesting names, which it is the special interest of mankind to know, will be enquired into, Sect. II. But to affirm, that the word *Aleim* always signifies a plurality of persons or agents, is to charge the Scriptures of the Old-Testament with absurdity, and those of the New with perverting their sense. It is said, Exod. vii. 1. "I have made thee (אֱלֹהִים, *Aleim*)

“ a God to Pharaoh.” Would it not be charging the Scriptures with absurdity to say, that they teach us to believe that JEHOVAH made Moses a plurality of persons, when he sent him to speak unto Pharaoh? One would think that this application of the word *Aleim*, in this text alone, would be sufficient to convince any one, that it doth not always denote a plurality of persons or agents. But this is not the only text; it is only one among many, in which the word *Aleim* hath a singular signification. I shall here only add another, Psal. xlv. 6, 7. “ Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom: thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.” It is the word *Aleim* that is translated *God* in both these verses; and it is the *Son* that is called *Aleim* in the one, and the *Father* that is called *Aleim* in the other. If therefore the word *Aleim* is always to be understood as signifying a plurality of persons, we must believe that there is a plurality of persons in the Son, and also a plurality of persons in the Father; that is, that at least the Father and the Son consist of two persons each, and so must at least make four persons betwixt them. To say that the Scriptures of the Old-Testament teach this, is surely a saying that they teach gross absurdity; this being an absurdity too gross to be named, were it not necessary to expose the absurdity of an idolized system. And since in the New-Testament the word *Aleim* is frequently rendered singular; as Heb. i. 8, 9. where this passage is quoted; and Mark xii. 29. where Deut. vi. 4. is quoted, as was formerly observed: The sense of the word would surely be perverted, if it meant a plurality in these texts in the original Hebrew, quoted in these passages.

But the word אֱלֹהִים, *Aleim*, is not the only one in the Hebrew Scriptures that has a plural form, and yet appears to have a singular signification. For we find

find **רחים** *rehim*, the nether mill-stone, Deut. xxiv. 6. **הריחים** *erihim*, the mill, Exod. xi. 5. and **צהרים** *tzerim*, or *zserim*, noon-day, Psal. xci. 6. Even the word **אדון**, which signifies a Lord or Master, is used in a plural form, when applied to one person; so Joseph is called **אדני הארע**, *the lord of the land*, Gen. xlii. 30. Those who know the Hebrew language, do know, that the final **ם** of a plural noun or name, is dropped when in construction with another word; so that **אדני**, in this text, is equal to **אדנים**. And the translators of the English have understood this name, even in the last form of it, to have a singular signification, 1 Kings xxii. 17. 2 Chron. xviii. 16. Isa. xix. 4. Mal. i. 6.

If we were fully acquainted with the Hebrew language, we would likely see a peculiar beauty in applying plural names to persons or things; not from these names denoting a plurality of persons or agents; but from their denoting the various relations or properties signified by the root from which the name is formed, that centre in the person or thing to which the name is applied.

And with respect to the name *Aleim*, it appears rather to be the plurality of relations sustained by the person or persons, to whom it is applied, than a plurality of persons, that is thereby pointed out. That the name *Aleim* is a *relative* name, is abundantly evident from the application of it in Scripture; and if the relation or relations expressed by this name be the same, whether sustained by one or more persons; or whether the person or persons be masculine or feminine; there appears to be no impropriety in this name being of the same form, in all these applications of it: Since it is not used to point out the number or gender of the person or persons to whom it is applied, but the relations which they sustain. Accordingly we find, that the name *Aleim*, hath the same form, not only when singular and plural, but also when masculine and feminine; as 1 Kings xi. 5, 33. where *Ashtaroath*, or *Oshtarut*, is called

called *Aleim*, and rendered the *goddeſs* of the Zidonians. The ſingular and plural, or masculine and feminine ſignifications of this name, ſeem therefore to be determined by the text and context where it occurs.

And why ſhould it appear any way ſtrange, that a Hebrew name ſhould be found that hath but one form, in all theſe different applications, ſince we find ſeveral of the ſame kind in our own language. To inſtance only one, the name *ſheep*; this name is of the ſame form, whether we ſay one ſheep or two ſheep, a male ſheep or a female ſheep.

From all which there ſeems to be very little ground to ſuppoſe that Deut. vi. 4. will prove a plurality in the unity of the eſſence. And thoſe who preſume to give it a ſenſe, ſo very different from the manner in which it is quoted and expreſſed by our Lord, Mark xii. 29. formerly taken notice of, ſeem rather to take too much upon them, when they give a reading different in ſenſe, from that which is given by him who muſt know infinitely better, what reading was moſt conducive to give a juſt diſcovery of the only true God, than the wiſeſt and moſt knowing of the ſons of men.

2. It is argued, that the name *Aleim* being ſometimes joined with plural verbs and pronouns, proves it to be a plural name.

To this it might be answered, that the name *Aleim* being frequently joined with ſingular verbs and pronouns, proves that it is a ſingular name.

Surely if its being only ſometimes joined with plural nouns and verbs be a proof that it is a plural noun, its being frequently joined with ſingular nouns and verbs muſt be a ſtronger proof that it is a ſingular noun. And certain it is, that all the inſtances that can be produced of the former, are quite inconfiderable, in compariſon of what might be produced of the latter. But ſince it cannot have a ſingular and plural ſignification at the ſame time, the text and context (as has been noticed), muſt determine whether

whether it is to be understood singular or plural; for that it may have either of these significations, in different places, is readily granted.

There are some texts, however, that have been made use of to prove the name *Aleim* to be plural, which do not appear any way to answer that end; such as, Gen. i. 26. "And *Aleim* said let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Gen. iii. 22. "And JEHOVAH, *Aleim*, said, behold the man is become like one of us." And Gen. xi. 6, 7. "And JEHOVAH said,—let us go down, &c." One would think, if *Aleim* must be plural, because joined with the expression *let us make*, then JEHOVAH must also be a plural name, because joined with the expression *let us go down*. But this last they hold to be singular, though the same evidence appears here to prove it to be plural, that is held out by them as sufficient to prove *Aleim* to be plural. The name *Aleim*, however, is as evidently joined with a singular verb in these texts; for the word rendered *said* is a singular verb in the original. And the form of expression used in these texts intimates to us, what the Scriptures at large do uniformly teach; namely, that all divine purposes relative to creatures originate from אֱלֹהִים עֶלְיוֹן *the Most High God*, and are carried into execution by Jesus Christ his only begotten Son. And the Son being an intelligent agent subsisting personally distinct from the Father, had these purposes intimated to him before they were carried into execution. Our Lord himself who best knew these things hath informed us, that "the Father loveth the Son and sheweth him all things that himself doth." John v. 20. It appears, therefore, that the same *Aleim*, (that is, the Father,) who said to the Son, *thy throne, O God, is forever and ever*; said also to the Son, *let us make man*. And the same JEHOVAH who said unto the Son, *Sit thou on my right hand*; said also to him, *let us go down*.

It is strange how it should have entered into the mind of any person to think that a name must be plural,

plural, or that there must be a plurality in what it is applied to, because it is joined with the expression, *let us*, &c. When nothing is more common, than for one single individual person to say, (when speaking to one or more, about any thing they are mutually concerned in,) *let us*, &c. So the Levites servant said, "Let us turn into this city," Judges xix.

11. "Jonathan said, let us go over unto the garri-
son of the Philistines," 1 Sam. xiv. 6. Nathan
said, "And David our lord knoweth it not," 1 Kings,
i. 11. And Jehu said, "Unto which of all us,"
2 Kings ix. 5. How ridiculous and absurd would it
be, to say that Jonathan, David, &c. are plural names,
denoting that Jonathan, David, &c. were each of
them plural beings; yet these names are as much
joined with plural verbs and pronouns as the name
Aleim in the texts before noticed. But those who
lay so much stress on the expression, LET US, and
think it so conclusive, when spoken by JEHOVAH, to
prove a plurality in the unity of the essence; may find
creatures, even *offending* creatures, included in that
expression, when spoken to by JEHOVAH himself.
Isa. i. 18. "Come now, and let us reason together,
"saith the Lord, (or JEHOVAH,) though your sins
"be as scarlet, &c." Will they say that this de-
notes plurality in unity? Surely not.

It has been said by way of reply to this; that the
expression, *Let us reason together*, supposes their ca-
pacity to reason, or "Implies their capacity for rea-
soning." And hence it seems to be inferred, that
when it is said, *Let us make man*, it implies a capa-
city to make man. This is surely all very just. And
it might also be inferred, that as the expression, *Let
us reason together*, implies that the persons spoken to
were endued with reasoning faculties distinct from
him that speaks to them; so the expression, *Let us
make man*, implies that the person spoken to, was en-
dued with a capacity to make man, distinct from him
that speaks to him. It was surely as possible for the
Father to give this capacity to the Son, as to give
him

him to have life in himself, even as he hath life in himself. But though this capacity in the Son to create, and his agency in the exertion of this capacity, be represented as distinct from the Father's capacity and agency; yet there appears to be always a joint operation of the Father and the Son, in every exertion of divine agency in or upon creatures, as has been already noticed.

There is indeed some likelihood that the name *Aleim* is plural in the two following texts, Gen. xx. 13. "*Aleim*, they caused me to wander." And Gen. xxv. 7. "*Aleim* were revealed unto him." But though this should be the true reading of these texts, all that they prove is, that the Father and the Son were jointly concerned in causing Abraham to leave his country and his kindred. And that the Father revealed himself unto Jacob through his only begotten Son.

There appears, therefore, to be no evidence to believe, that the name *Aleim* is ever intended to denote a plurality in the unity of the essence, in any place in which it occurs.

3. The doctrine of a plurality or trinity of persons in the unity of the essence, is also supposed to be proved from the figurative representation of the cherubim.

From this it is argued, that the different faces of the cherubim represented the different persons in the essence. That the face of the ox was an emblem of fire, and fire an emblem of the Father; that the face of the lion was an emblem of light, and light an emblem of the Son; that the face of a man was an emblem of the human nature of the Son; that the face of an eagle was an emblem of air, and air an emblem of the Holy Spirit.

Now, suppose it should be granted that these faces were emblems of the Father, and the Son, &c. (which does not appear to be the case, when the matter is examined into,) it would remain to be shown

shown, how these emblematic faces prove, either proper personality, or equality.

The only argument that can be adduced for distinct personality, seems to be, from the distinction of these faces from one another. But according to this, it would follow that there are four distinct persons; for the face of the man is as distinct from the face of the lion, as the face of the lion is distinct from the face of the ox. And the argument for equality and unity of essence, can only be deduced from the faces being all of one substance, namely one mass of gold. This seems to be viewed as a most clear and demonstrative evidence of the equality of the persons, and the unity of their essence. But then, like the other, it proves too much; for according to this argument, the humanity is proved to be equal, and of the same substance with the divinity; since the face of the man was of the same substance and quality with the other faces. These consequences being both inevitable, and inadmissible, the arguments from which they flow must be void of force, and altogether inconclusive. Since therefore the cherubim or cherubs, even in this view, fail to prove the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the unity of the essence; it seems of small consequence to the point in dispute, whether they be viewed as emblems of the Father and the Son, together with the Humanity and the Holy Spirit, or not.

But as the cherubims are frequently mentioned in Scripture, a short view of what is said of them, may help us in some measure to judge, whether they appear to be a representation of JEHOVAH, or a representation of the attendants of his throne.

We have the most full and particular account of the cherubim in the 1st and 10th chapters of Ezekiel's prophecy. It is said, Ezek. i. 10. 26. "As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion on the right side, and they four had the face of an ox on the left side, and they four had the face of an eagle.

" And

“ And above the firmament that was over their
 “ heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appear-
 “ ance of sapphire stone, and upon the likeness of
 “ the throne was the likeness as the appearance of
 “ a man above upon it.” And, Ezek. x. 20.
 “ This is the living creature that I saw under the
 “ God of Israel.” Language can scarce be more
 descriptive of a distinction between the God of Israel
 and the cherubs or cherubim, than that which is
 here used. Yet it has been alledged, that the che-
 rubims are not to be considered as being *under* the
 God of Israel, but that they were seen *instead* of
 the God of Israel; because the word **תחת** rendered
under, often signifies *instead of*, as well as *under*.
 But the whole representation seems strongly to for-
 bid this sense of the word here, and to confirm the
 reading quoted above from the English Bible; for
 the firmament is represented above the cherubim,
 the throne above the firmament, and the God of
 Israel above the throne; the cherubim called the
 living creature was therefore certainly seen *under*,
 not *instead of*, the God of Israel, who was seen in a
 figurative representation above the throne, encircled
 with a rain-bow, not unsimilar to what is recorded
 Rev. iv. 2, 4.

We have also a representation of the glory of JE-
 HOVAH, Isa. vi. 1, 2, 3. “ In the year that king Uz-
 “ ziah died, I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne
 “ high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple.
 “ Above it stood the seraphim, or seraphs, each one
 “ having six wings;—And one cried unto another,
 “ and said, holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts,
 “ the whole earth is full of his glory.”

So likewise, Rev. iv. 2,—8. “ And immediately
 “ I was in the spirit; and behold, a throne was set
 “ in heaven, and one sat upon the throne. And he
 “ that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sar-
 “ dine-stone; and there was a rain-bow round about
 “ the throne, in sight like unto an emerald. And
 “ in the midst of the throne, and round about the
 “ throne,

“ throne, were four beasts,” or rather *four, living ones*, “ full of eyes before and behind. And the “ first living one was like a lion, and the second living one was like a calf, and the third living one “ had a face as a man, and the fourth living one “ was like a flying eagle. And the four living ones “ had each of them six wings,—and they rest not “ day and night, saying, holy, holy, holy Lord God “ Almighty.”

There is a very great similarity in all these visions; and the last, namely that which was seen by the apostle John, seems to include in the description of the living ones, or living creatures, all that is said of the cherubim and seraphim in former visions; for their faces agree in number and kind with the cherubim or cherubs, and the number of their wings and their exercise, agrees with what is said of the seraphim or seraphs. And hence, it appears, that whatever was represented by the cherubim, the same, or something similar, behoves to be represented by the four living ones. This is allowed by those who hold the cherubim to be a representation of a trinity in unity. Now, it is evident, that the four living creatures represent beings that worship; for Rev. v. 8. “ The four living creatures, and the four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb.” And say, verse 9. “ Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us by “ thy blood.”

Since therefore the cherubim are said to be under the God of Israel, and the living creatures say they are redeemed by the blood of the lamb; it seems to be very evident, that they are not a representation of a trinity of divine persons in one essence, as some contend.

With respect to the cherubim that were placed in the tabernacle and temple, it is said of them, that their faces were toward one another, toward the mercy-seat, Exod. xxv. 20. and xxxvii. 9. *Predeaux* observes, that their faces being inward, denotes,

that

that they were figures worshipping, not to be worshipped. It might also be observed, that JEHOVAH is several times said to dwell between or inhabit the cherubim; but he is never, (so far as I know,) said to be represented by them. From all which it appears, that whatever these figures were intended to represent, it was not that plurality in unity, which some so warmly contend for.

But that something was figured out by the cherubim, seems very certain; and also that the thing figured out by them did some way concern mankind; since they were so constantly exhibited in those sanctuaries that God placed among men. There was an exhibition of the cherubim immediately after the fall, with the rest of the apparatus of the sanctuary. We know there had been an altar, because there were sacrifices; and the words rendered *flaming sword*, which might have been rendered *consuming flame*, seem to denominate the sacred fire. The whole exhibition being calculate by infinite wisdom, to point out, and to keep the way to the true tree of life in their midst. But if this should appear dark or uncertain, there can be no doubt that the tabernacle and temple services were appointed for this end, Neither have we any ground to doubt that the earthly tabernacle and temple were figures of the heavenly. See Heb. ix. 9, 23, 24.

Now the entering of the High Priest into the holy of holies once every year, appears to have been intended to represent the entering of the Lord Jesus Christ into the heaven itself, when he should have accomplished his humiliation and sufferings. And this service of the High Priest entering into the holy of holies, may be considered not only as representing to their faith this great and interesting event; but also as giving them an assured token, or earnest of its accomplishment, that as they saw or were assured that the High Priest entered into the holy of holies, which were the figures of the true; so the promised Messiah, would, in due time, most certainly, enter

the heavens itself, or holy of holies above, clothed with a body of the seed of the woman, there to appear in the presence of God, in behalf of all who are to be blessed in him. Since therefore the sufferings of Christ and his entrance into the higher sanctuary, were figured out by the sacrifices and entrance of the High Priest into the holy of holies; is it not at least probable, that the fruits or effects that were to issue therefrom, should also be figured out, or represented, by something in that figurative sanctuary? And if this was the case, the cherubim seem to be figures intended for this purpose. The Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil, 1 John iii. 8. To take away our sins, verse 5. He suffered without the gate, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, Heb. xiii. 12. And when sin is destroyed, or taken away, and sanctification effected; then is the image of God restored, and the creature is then fit to be presented in his presence, having neither spot nor wrinkle nor any such thing. Creatures thus created a-new by Christ Jesus, may with propriety be called כְּרוּבִים, *kerubim*, that is, the likenesses of the great ones; which the word rendered cherubims, doth signify; for being created into the likeness of the Son, they are of consequence created into the likeness of the Father also. The faces of the cherubim being inward towards the mercy-seat, the place where the divine presence was manifested, and from whence the will of God was intimated; might represent the condition and exercise, of those who are brought into the presence of God, in the sanctuary above; being within the vail, might represent their being brought into the heaven itself; looking to the mercy-seat, that attentiveness to behold the glory of God shining forth through Jesus Christ, and the wonders of mercy displayed through him; and standing with outstretched wings, their readiness to fulfil his pleasure with the greatest speed. And the complication of faces, that were thus deposited in
the

the holy of holies, might intimate God's gracious purpose according to his good pleasure; that in the dispensation of the fulness of the times, he would gather together all things in Christ, deliver the creation from the bondage of corruption, and bring every creature into the glorious liberty of the sons of God; so that every creature in heaven and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, should harmoniously join in ascribing blessing, and glory, and honour, and power, to him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb, for ever and ever. See Col. i. 20. Eph. i. 9, 10. Rom. viii. 21. Rev. v. 13.

4. The doctrine of a plurality or trinity of persons in one essence, is supposed to be proved by analogy, taken from three conditions of the material heavens; that is, fire, light, and air.

It is alledged, -if I mistake not, that the matter of the heavens subsist in the condition of fire in the body of the sun, from which there is a continual emanation of the same matter in the condition of light; that this matter, acquiring a grossness by distance from the sun, is changed into air; and so is pushed back into the sun, where it is changed into fire, and again into light. And that by this continual egress and ingress, a perpetual motion is produced, which, with an admirable regularity, carries all the planets in the solar system round their proper orbs. However just this may be, as a system of philosophy, it seems no way suited to prove by analogy, that there are three persons in one divine essence.

Those who make use of it for this purpose, suppose that the Father is represented by the fire in the body of the sun; because, as is also supposed, he is spoken of under the notion of fire in Scripture; and that wrath, signified by fire, is peculiarly exerted by him; for proof of which, Deut. iv. 24. Heb. xii. 29. are brought, with some other texts less direct to the purpose.

But, with respect to these things, it may be observed,

served, that no visible representation seems proper to represent the invisible God, whom no one hath seen at any time. And as to fire representing, or wrath being peculiarly exerted by the Father; the Scriptures quoted in proof of it, will not serve that purpose, unless it can be proved, that the Father distinctly and absolutely considered, was the Lord God of Israel, Deut. iv. 24. and that when it is said, Heb. xii. 29. *For our God is a consuming fire*, the Father is meant absolutely and distinctly considered. But this can never be proved from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which uniformly teach, that the God of believers, under both the Old and New Testament dispensations, is the Father manifested in and by his only begotten Son, who is the express image of his person, and the brightness or shining forth of his glory.

Since, therefore, this analogy fails in the leading and chief article, it seems needless to trace it further in this way of applying it. But if we may make use of analogy, it will perhaps be found to illustrate the doctrine it has been brought to oppose.

It seems to be the opinion of those who have applied their minds to the study of nature, that a principle called fire, fill almost, if not altogether, the whole material system; yet it produces no sensible effects, nor is its operations, or even its presence, known, till excited by some proper means through some proper medium; but when these concur, it will extend its operations in the most tremendous manner, as far and wide as the combustible matter in contact is extended. What we commonly call fire, appears therefore to be only a manifestation of that invisible fire or active principle, through the matter upon which it operates. When wood, coal, or any other combustible matter is burning, we see its colour and texture change, and its magnitude diminish by that operation; and when we approach to a certain nearness, we find a sensation excited in our bodies thereby; but still the principle that produces all
this

this remains hid from our view. This invisible fire or principle that produces such wonderful operations, when excited to action through a proper medium, seems to act most powerfully and constantly in the body of the sun.

These things observed, if we may venture to speak of the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit, by analogy from things in nature, fire, light, and heat, may be considered as follows.

I. The invisible fire, which is so universally extended through the whole material creation, and yet is only perceived in its operations through a proper medium, may lead by analogy to a consideration of the invisible God, who, though he fills heaven and earth, neither produceth any effect upon his creatures, nor is perceived by them, but by the manifestations he makes of himself through Christ Jesus, the only mediator between God and men, and medium of all divine intercourse with creatures.

II. The visible fire of which the body of the sun is composed, and from whence an energy is exerted through the whole solar system, may lead to a consideration of the Son of God, who is the brightness of the Father's glory, and whose powerful energy is exerted through the whole system of created nature. This is perfectly agreeable to the Scriptures of truth; for these teach that it is in the face of Jesus that the glory of God is beheld, 2 Cor. iii. 18.; that he is the image of the invisible God, Col. i. 15. And it is the Son of God, through whom all the perfections and operations of the invisible God are manifested, who is represented in Scripture under the similitude of fire. It was surely God, thus manifested, that was the God of Israel, and is also the God of the New-Testament Church, as before noticed. Some, indeed, through the unscriptural representations that have been given of God, have used the expression, "God out of Christ is a consuming fire." But this has no foundation in Scripture; for we are there taught, that all God's dealings with men are through

a mediator : And with respect to the execution of judgment in particular, our Lord says expressly, " the Father judgeth (*judges*) no one ; but hath committed all judgment to the Son : and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man," John v. 22, 27. It is therefore evident, that the execution of judgment, inflicting of punishment, or the manifesting of fiery indignation, belongs properly to the Son, who is therefore represented with the appearance of fire, in those glorious representations of him that are recorded in Scripture. When the prophet Ezekiel saw the glory of the God of Israel, the appearance of a man which he saw upon the throne, was certainly a representation of Christ ; and this appearance of a man which he saw, had the appearance of fire from his loins and upward, and from his loins and downward ; this was the appearance of fire throughout. See Ezek. i. 27. When the apostle John also had a vision of Christ, his eyes were as a flame of fire, and his feet like fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace. See Rev. i. 14, 15. And it is likewise declared concerning Christ, Mal. iii. 2. He is like a refiner's fire. Matth. iii. 12. He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. 2 Thess. i. 7, 8. He will be revealed from heaven,—in flaming fire, &c.

All these considered, it will appear that the Lord Jesus Christ may be fully represented by the fire of which the body of the sun consists ; and the analogy seems to be very directly countenanced by divine inspiration, since Christ the Son of God is called *the Sun of righteousness*, Mal. iv. 2. To enumerate a few particulars in which there seems to be a kind of analogy, it may be observed,

1. That as the sun in the firmament is a visible manifestation of an invisible principle ; so Christ is the image of the invisible God.

2. That as the properties of the invisible principle are manifested in their operations through the sun in the firmament ; so the perfections of the invisible Father

Father are manifested in his operations through his only begotten Son. It is by his works that God discovers to us his perfections. "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made," Rom. i. 20. and Eph. iii. 9. "God created all things by Jesus Christ."

3. That as animal and vegetative life is quickened and invigorated by the genial influences of the sun; so spiritual and divine life is quickened and carried into perfection by the gracious influences of Christ, who is called a *quickening Spirit*.

4. That as the influences of the sun extend thro' the whole solar system, which perhaps includes the whole material creation, as it is said Psal. xix. 6. "there is nothing hid from the heat thereof;" so the influences that flow from the Lord Jesus Christ, extend through the whole system of created nature; for "All things are delivered into his hand," Mat. xi. 27. "And by him all things consist," Col. i. 17. Even the sun, whose glorious brightness is too intense for our mortal eyes; is but the workmanship of his hand, and made subservient by him, to dispense his bounty through the material creation. And thus the outward creation, and distribution of outward favours, seem admirably calculate to lead to a contemplation of uncreated excellency and munificence, as manifested in Christ Jesus; in whom are all the promises, and who communicates all the privileges that mankind enjoy, whether pertaining to life or godliness. See 2 Cor. i. 20. 2 Pet. i. 3.

III. The influence that proceeds from the sun, may lead to a consideration of the Holy Spirit. For,

1. As the influence that proceeds from the sun in the firmament, has a twofold efficacy, namely, that of enlightening and warming; so the Holy Spirit, that influence that proceeds from the Father through the Son, has a twofold efficacy, namely, that of enlightening

lightening the mind in the knowledge of divine things, and warming the heart with love thereto.

2. As the effects of enlightening and warming are produced in unequal proportion, in different matter, or the same matter differently disposed or arranged; though the influence be uniform in itself, simply considered: so the effects of enlightening the mind, and warming the heart with love to divine things, are produced in unequal proportion, in different persons, and perhaps the same person under different circumstances. We shall perhaps find, that the highest degree of love to God and men, is no more necessarily connected, with a clear understanding, than the highest degree of heat is connected with a clear day. But as matter may be so modified as to receive both light and heat in a high degree, and in equal proportion; so intelligent nature may be so modified as to receive a high degree of divine light and love, in equal proportion. Those represented by the good ground in the parable, are described as approaching toward it, for they not only understand the word, but received it into honest and good hearts. See Matth. xiii. 23. and compare Luke viii. 13.

3. As this influence that proceeds from the sun, is called by the same name with the sun from which it proceeds, or the effects produced by it, are ascribed either to it or the sun, both in common conversation; as when a thing may be said to be warmed by the sun, or by the heat of the sun; and in Scripture, as when things are said to be put forth by the sun, Deut. xxxiii. 14. and when the sun is said not to (*πικν*) fall upon persons, Rev. vii. 16. In these passages it is evident that the influence of the sun is that which is properly meant; so in a very similar manner, things are said to be done by the Father and the Son, that are properly effected by the Holy Spirit, as the immediate agency by which they are done.

S E C T.

S E C T. II.

Of the Arguments that are commonly used to prove the Equality of the Father and the Son.

IT is argued, 1. That the same names being applied to the Son that are applied to the Father ; therefore the Son must be one substance, and equal with the Father, in power and glory.

This argument has already been considered, and shown to be false and inconclusive, p. 43. But as it was promised that an enquiry should be made, into the import or signification of these names that are supposed to prove the doctrine contended for in the objection : The following is offered to the consideration of impartial enquirers. These names are, JEHOVAH, LORD and GOD ; and also I AM THAT I AM. It is to be observed that there are three Hebrew names, that are generally rendered Lord in the English translation, and they are these יה IE, יהוה IEUE, and אדון ADUN, or אדני ADNI. The two first of these names appear to have an affinity with one another, that is, the second appears to be derived from the first. The Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, called the Septuagint, frequently uses the word κυριος indifferently for either of the above Hebrew words, as the English translation uses the word *Lord*. The Greek word κυριος *kurios*, and the English word *Lord*, seem to be very proper translations of the Hebrew words אדון or אדני, *Adun* or *Adni* ; for it is evident from the application of these words in Scripture, that either of them signifies, that authority or dominion belongs to the person to whom either of them is applied ; being used to denote a lord or master. The name אדני *Adni*, seems to be frequently applied to Christ the Son of God, as Psal. cx. 1. “ (יהוה *Ieue*) JEHOVAH said to “ (אדני *Adni*) my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, “ until

“until I make thine enemies thy footstool.” And Isa. vi. 1. “I saw (יְהוָה *Adni*) the Lord sitting up-
“on a throne.” This name when applied to *Christ Jesus*, that is, the *Anointed Saviour*, fitly points him out as the universal Lord of all created nature; but when applied to the Father, it must be understood in a still higher sense, since inspiration teaches that the Son is made both Lord and Christ by the Father.

The name *Lord*, however, seems not to express what is the import of יְהוָה *Ie*, nor of יְהוֹה *Ieue*. There seems to be sufficient evidence to think, that יְהוָה is the root from whence יְהוֹה the verb, which signifies *to be*, or *to be caused to be*, is derived; for it is most natural that the most simple form of a word should be the root from whence all its augmented forms do spring. The word יְהוָה *Ie*, then, will signify *simple* or *absolute Being*. It is therefore a most proper name for that Being or Essence, that is the source, the root, and first cause of all real and permanent existence; even the one Most High invisible God the Father, of whom are all things. This name is never used relatively, nor is it ever applied to any being or person, but God the Father, so far as I have observed. It was observed, that יְהוֹה *Ieue* appears to be derived from יְהוָה *Ie*; and the process of its derivation or formation I take to be this; יְהוָה is the simple root, signifying simple and absolute Being. But as no action can be exerted to cause being of this kind, the word never occurs as a verb in this simple form. The first step from this simple form is the prefixing of the letter ה, which forms that conjugation of a Hebrew verb which signifies to cause a thing to be, or be done; and then it stands thus, יְהוֹה *Eie*; and this being the form of the verb which expresses the existence of persons and things, there appears to be a peculiar simplicity, propriety, and precision in the Hebrew language, in indicating that every creature and thing, *is caused to be*, by the same word that indicates their *existence* or *being*. The next step is the prefixing the letter ו, which forms

forms several proper names, and changing the ' in the middle into ך; and then the word יהוה is completely formed, which, according to this formation, will signify, he that causeth to be, or is the cause of being.

Several words of a similar construction might be produced to support the formation here proposed; I shall only instance one, namely, יהושע, *Ieusho*, read in the Old Testament *Joshua*, in the new *Jesus*, and signifies he that saves, or causeth salvation; ישע is the simple root, and signifies salvation, or simply to save, ה being prefixed, forms the second conjugation as before noticed, and the letter ' being prefixed again, and the first ' changed into ך, the word יהושע is formed, in the same manner as יהוה, from יה before noticed.

The name יהוה, IEUE, read JEHOVAH, appears therefore not to be an absolute name, as several have alledged; and that not only from the import of the word, as noticed above, which has all the evidence of certainty that the nature of the case can admit; but also from the clear and undoubted application of it in Scripture; for Jehovah is frequently used relatively with hosts. And what relation can be supposed so likely as that which is denoted by the formation of the name יהוה, *Ieue*, or *Jehovah*, as already noticed. The expression *Lord of hosts*, or *Jehovah of hosts*, appears therefore to signify the same as to say, *the cause of the being of hosts*, or *he who is the cause of being to hosts*. And this expression being so frequently repeated when promises are made to the faithful, when surrounded with powerful hosts, that are likely to destroy them; seems intended to put them in mind of his superintending providence, and absolute power, that they may set their hope in him; by teaching them, that though hosts spread terror and desolation among those against whom their force is directed, and the destruction of a defenceless people seems certain when they set themselves against them; yet when they are assured of protection, by him from whom hosts have their being, and on whom their being, of consequence, depends, it may quiet their fears, and

animate them with courage to pursue their duty. These things, I think, will appear very plain to any who consider the Scriptures in general, and particularly the prophecies of Hagai and Zechariah. Therefore the name JEHOVAH being a relative name, and there being no relations sustained by the Father to his creatures, but what are sustained through Jesus Christ his only begotten Son; every relative name may be applied to the Son that is applied to the Father, and the name JEHOVAH among the rest.

But it will not follow of consequence, that because this name is applied to the Son, that therefore he is equal with the Father, unless it be proved that he is the cause of being, in the same manner as the Father is; and this cannot be done from the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, for they teach the reverse, as has been shewed. Our Lord speaking of a miracle he had wrought, says, *my Father worketh hitherto, and I work*; we are not to suppose, that this work was wrought by the Father and the Son, as two men perform a piece of work between them, that is, by each doing a part of it, surely not; for, in the sense in which any work is done by the Father, it is wholly done by him, and in the sense in which it is done by the Son, it is wholly done by him. Every work performed by the Son of God, is wholly done by him as the immediate agent by whom the energy is exerted by which it is done; while at the same time it is wholly done by the Father, as he who communicates the energy that is necessary for effecting it. Or, it is done by the Father as the first cause, from whom the energy proceeds by which the work is done; and it is done by the Son, as he by whom that energy is manifested in doing the work. So it is said, Acts ii. 22. — *By miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him.* The same form of expression being used concerning the creation of all things, namely, that *God created all things by Jesus Christ*; it plainly shews, that creating power flowed from God the Father as the source of being, and first cause of existence; and that it was exerted by Jesus Christ his only begotten Son,

as the agent by or through whom it should operate.

Hence the name יהוה *Ieue* or *Jehovah*, when applied to the Father as distinct from the Son, points him out as he who is the cause of being in the highest sense of the word. And when applied to the Son, it points him out as the cause of being in a secondary sense; he being the cause of being, or יהוה, by an anointing immediately from the Father, even the fulness of יהוה, the simple absolute essence, *i. e.* the invisible God dwelling in him. If any shall ask, how things can be caused to be in a secondary sense? It may be answered, That when such as ask this question shall tell how God might have created, or caused things to be without the interposition of a begotten nature, that is, without his only begotten Son, who was capable of the inferior character of *Messiah*, or *Christ*, that is, *the anointed*; they may then expect to be told how God created all things by Jesus Christ, or how the Son of God is *JEHOVAH, i. e. the cause of being* in a secondary sense. But with what shadow of reason, can any who profess to believe that God spake to mankind by Jesus Christ, that he wrought miracles by him, and that by him as an inferior agent, he effects the new creation; with what shadow of reason I say, can any believe that God effects all these by the agency of an inferior nature, or that Jesus Christ is the cause of these in a secondary sense, and deny that God created all things by Jesus Christ in the same sense, when this last is testified by the same authority, and in terms as explicit?

If we attend to the language of Scripture, we will find an uniformity in all the divine agency therein recorded. We are there taught, that God created all things by Jesus Christ, that he upholds all things by him, and that he governs all things by him; for it is said, the government shall be upon his shoulders. The Father is also said to have spoken by him, that by him he is reconciling the world unto himself, and that by him he will judge the world at last.

We have an account of a very remarkable event, the circumstances of which, as recorded in sacred history, among other useful purposes, seem very

much to illustrate and confirm what has been said of the name JEHOVAH, as applied to the Father and the Son distinctly considered. It is the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the neighbouring cities; concerning this it is said, Gen. xix. 24. "And יהוה JEHOVAH caused it to rain upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone, מאת יהוה from the JEHOVAH out of heaven." JEHOVAH who is first named, seems to be the Son, and the JEHOVAH who is last named, seems to be the Father. The last is not only distinguished from the first, by being named separately, but also by the article, or emphatic particle אה being put before the name יהוה, *Ieue*, or JEHOVAH. The Hebrews have two articles, and that which is here used is said to be the most emphatic, and appears to be so from its application in many places of Scripture. Now when the emphatic article is put before the JEHOVAH who is last named, and no article put before the other, who is first named, it strongly indicates, that the one is to be understood in a *supreme* sense, denoting him who is *the cause of being* in the *first* and *highest* sense; and the other in a *subordinate* sense, denoting him who is *the cause of being* in a *secondary* way. From the whole, it appears, that the name JEHOVAH being applied to the Son, is no proof of his being equal with the Father.

With respect to the name *I am*, recorded Exod. iii. 14. This is a translation of the Hebrew word אהיה, and seems to be very imperfect. The words אהיה אשר אהיה are also read, *I am that I am*; the Greek translation called the Septuagint read them Εγω ειμι ο ων, *I am he that is*. Both *Ainsworth* and *Pool* observe, that the words in the Hebrew are future; it is also well known that the subjunctive mood is expressed by the future form of the verb in Hebrew. Therefore the reading I would propose, with all humility and deference to better judgments, is this, *I will be what I should be*. This is as literal a reading as any, and the reason why I would prefer it to our common reading is, that the expression *I am that I am*, expresses nothing more than what may be said of any thing that is; for it may be said of the meanest

est and vilest person *he is what he is*, or such a person might say *I am what I am*; besides, *I am that or what I am*, is not a just translation. The words might indeed be read, *I shall be what I shall be*. But this, like the other, has nothing peculiar or distinguishing; for any one may say, *I shall be what I shall be*. But if the words are read *I will be what I should be*, which is equally just and literal, they convey something of importance, in several respects. This seems to be an expression which no creature can use; or affirm of himself, at least as to every period of existence; but used with great propriety by the Son of God, who shall through all (*τας αιωνας των αιωνων*) *the ages of ages* of his mediatory kingdom, and through endless duration, be in every respect what he should be; by acting fully up to the high characters he bears, and fulfilling most completely, all that belongs to the complicated offices that belong to him as mediator. These do chiefly concern his people in their present state, and to *these*, the words *I will be what I should be*, may have a special respect. These words may point out something very significant, either respecting the Israelites in particular, or the world in general. With respect to the Israelites, it is very plain that their deliverance *should* take place at the proper time, not from any obligation that JEHOVAH was under to deliver them, because of any thing they had done or could do; but because he had graciously promised to do it. So the words *I will be what I should be*, amounts to the same as if he had said, "As I should be true to my promise made unto your fathers, so I will now manifest myself to be so, in accomplishing your deliverance by the person I have now sent." This sense seems to agree very well with the next verse, where he immediately adds, "Moreover, thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob hath sent me unto you: This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations."

But though the deliverance of the Israelites from their bondage in Egypt was included in that covenant

nant which God declared and confirmed unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; it was but a small part of the privileges or good things that were contained therein. Deliverance from the bondage of corruption, was of much greater importance, than deliverance from the bondage of Egypt; and the promise made to Abraham, that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed, was much more extensive than that his seed, according to the flesh, should come forth from under the hand of their oppressors with great substance. But in order to accomplish that great promise on which all the other promises depended; namely, that of the Son of God becoming the seed of Abraham, in whom all nations were to be blessed, the seed of the woman who was to bruise the serpent's head; in order to this, a change behove to take place upon the Son of God; that is, he who was rich behove to become poor; he who had appeared in the most glorious forms, possessing a fulness of power, and every other perfection, behove to empty himself, and lay aside the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and take upon him the form of a servant. All which and much more may be included in the these words, **אֲהִיָּהוּ**, *I will be what I should be*. It seems as if he had said, as by virtue of what is promised, and figuratively represented in the ordinance of the covenant, I *should* be made flesh, have my heel bruised by the serpent, that I may bruise his head, or be exposed to sufferings and death, that I may destroy death, and him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil; be made an offering for sin, that I may spoil principalities and powers, triumph over them by the blood of the cross, and enter the holy of holies with my own blood, as a glorious Conqueror and Captain of Salvation, made perfect through sufferings, in order to complete the salvation of those committed to my government; so I will most certainly *be*, or *be caused to be*, all this, that I may free you from the bondage of corruption, and bring you into the heavenly inheritance, of which your temporal deliverance

deliverance, and possession of Canaan, which I will now according to promise effect, is but a shadow or type.

This appears, therefore, to be a designation of the Son of God, not of the unbegotten essence, that we have expressed, by the words *I will be what I should be*. We have the testimony of Stephen to the truth of this, who was the first witness, under the New Testament dispensation, that sealed the testimony of Jesus with his blood. He not only calls the person who appeared to Moses in the bush, an angel, but also, that God delivered the people by his hand; thereby intimating, that the visible God who appeared to Moses was the agent by whom the invisible God effected these things. His words are, Acts vii. 35. "The same (Moses) did God send to be a ruler and a deliverer by the hand of the angel who appeared to him in the bush." So instead of proving equality, the words אֱלֹהֵי אֲשֶׁר אֱלֹהֵי, used as a designation of him who spoke, or by whom the Father spoke, do rather prove the reverse; for אֱלֹהֵי being the first person singular from the verb הָיָה, which, as before noticed, denotes *caused being*; it denotes something passive, which can in no respect apply to the unbegotten essence.

With respect to the name, or rather names, that are generally rendered God in the English translation; these are אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהֵי, אֵל. The name אֵל, *Al*, appears to be the root from whence the other two are formed, and may therefore be first enquired into. As a particle, אֵל signifies *to* or *unto* when put before a name; when put before a verb, it denotes prevention or hindering, and may be read *no* or *not*; and as an adverb, it denotes a doubtful state of the mind. As a name, it signifies strength or might, and with ' inserted, which makes it אֱלֹהֵי, it signifies much the same. See Dent. xxviii. 33. Psal. lxxxviii. 4. Mic. ii. 1. In this form, it is applied to what is the *strongest* or *principal* of the kind: To the mighties of Moab, Exod. xv. 15. To rams, Exod. xxix. 1. To harts, Lam. i. 6. And to the posts or pillars, which are the strength and ornament of buildings, Ezek. xl. 14.

The

The leading idea of the word seems, therefore, to be that of *strength* and *excellency*. The word אֵל, as a name, may, therefore, be fitly applied to the Father in the highest sense; he being the most mighty and most excellent one, and is called אֵל עֲלִיּוֹן, *the most high God*, or the *most high, mighty, and excellent One*, Gen. xiv. 18, 19. If applied to the Son, it may point him out as one, who, next to the Father, is the most mighty and powerful one; he being possessed of excellency and strength, surpassing that of all created nature, in an unmeasurable degree.

The names אֵלֹהִים, *Alue*, and אֱלֹהִים, *Aleim*, do not appear to be formed immediately from אֵל, *Al*, but from אֱלֵה, *Ale*. This last has several significations, but all of them seem to imply or refer to the radical meaning of the word אֵל, *Al*, from which it is formed by postfixing the letter ה, which in that position frequently denotes toward what is expressed in the word. This word אֱלֵה, among other things, signifies an oath, or to be brought under the bond of an oath; and this application of it hath a very evident implication and reference to strength and excellency; for the idea of strength is implied in an oath, as it binds the person who comes under it in the strongest manner to fulfil what is engaged to; and it refers to him who is Most Mighty and excellent, as it is an appeal to the Most High for the fulfilling of what is engaged to.

The name אֵלֹהִים, *Alue*, then, being in the form of a participle passive, from אֱלֵה, *Ale*, as a verb, it seems to denote a sworn or covenanted one; and so is peculiarly, or in a special manner, expressive of the character of the Son of God, who in a special manner came under the bond of the covenant established between the Father and him, in behalf of perishing sinners. And this name, if applied to the Father, may point him out as sustaining a covenant relation to his people through his Son Jesus Christ. The name אֵלֹהִים, *Alue*, occurs, I think, oftner in the book of Job than in all the other books of the Bible besides. And Job seems to express a firm belief, that he whom he so often calls *Alue*, would be-

come

come an object of sight in the flesh. Chap. xix. 25, 26.

The name אלהים, *Aleim*, seems also to be formed from אלה as a verb, and has the form of a participle plural active; according to which, it seems to denote one or more, who bring into the covenant. That it is *Aleim*, that is, *God*, who brings his people under the bond of the covenant which he hath been graciously pleased to manifest in his word, is very plainly intimated to us, Deut. xxix. 10,—12. “Ye stand all of you this day before the Lord your God;—לעברך, for to bring thee into the covenant of JEHOVAH thy ALEIM, and into (אלתו, *Aletu*) his oath.” And the end for which he brings them under his covenant is, that they may be brought unto himself, who is their (אל *Al*) excellency and strength, their all in all. The import of this name may perhaps be further learned, from its application in other places of Scripture. It is applied to angels, Psal. xcvi. 7. and viii. 5.; and it is said of them, Heb. i. 14. “Are they not all “ministring spirits sent forth to minister for them “that shall be heirs of salvation.” It is also applied to judges among men, Exod. xxi. 6. and xxii. 9. and to Moses, Exod. vii. 1. From these applications of this name *Aleim* in a subordinate sense, it appears to denote a kind of superintendency or disposing power in those to whom it is thus applied; what is signified by the name, being conferred on them in a certain degree, by the supreme *Aleim*, for effecting his gracious purposes relative to those to whom they sustained this character. This name, therefore, from its form, and the known exercise of some of those to whom it is applied in a subordinate sense, appears to be a fit name in its most supreme sense, to denominate the most High to be one who has interposed his power, and is exerting a most excellent providence in behalf of his creatures in general, and the faithful in particular, through Jesus Christ his only begotten Son, who is the great agent by whom he effects all his purposes; to whom the name *Aleim* is therefore also applicable, and that in a sense inconceivably higher than it can be applied to any

any creature whatever; for he is *Aleim*, the God of the whole earth; Θεός, God over-all, the Father excepted; whose exclusive prerogative it is to be the *Aleim* of Jesus Christ, and who anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows.

It might here be observed, that the Greek name Θεός, *Theos*, God, seems to preserve in general the idea of the Hebrew name אלהים, *Aleim*. There appears to be a connection between the word Θεός as a name; and δίδω as a verb. This last signifies *to place, assign, or appoint*. *Theos*, as a name, may therefore denote one who has some special right and power to dispose of, or regulate matters of high and general importance. It is also capable of being applied either in a supreme or subordinate sense, as both the Scriptures and profane writings of the Greeks do abundantly shew.

The plural form of the name *Aleim* has already been taken notice of, and shown to have but one form, whether singular or plural, masculine or feminine; and it was also observed, that the plural form seems rather to denote the complicated relations included in that name, than a plurality of persons. It may also denote *dignity*, as the Hebrews seem to have used a plural termination to express the superlative degree. Thus, צהרים, *tzerim*, noon-day, which is the highest degree of light or splendor, is the plural of צהר, *tzer*, which signifies light or splendor. So also זלות, *zelut*, the plural of זל, *zel*, vile, Psal. xii. 8. where it is read *vilest* in the English Bible; and the reading seems well supported from its being joined with a singular verb. Other instances might be given, but these may suffice at present.

Thus far concerning the import or signification of the names which are generally insisted on, as proving a plurality of persons in one essence, and an equality among these persons. And from the whole it appears, that instead of proving any of these, they prove the very reverse, if the Scripture sense and application of them be duly attended to.

2. The doctrine of equality is argued from several texts of Scripture; of which the following, with those before noticed, seem to have the greatest appearance

of

of affording a foundation for an argument of this kind ; at least they have been used so by some.

1. The Apostles words, as translated Philip. ii. 6. " Who being in the form of God thought it no robbery to be equal with God ;" are supposed to be quite decisive in this matter. This sense is so inconsistent with the foregoing and following verses, that some of the most judicious and learned on that side of the controversy have refused it. A learned and judicious lexicographer on the word *μορφη* takes particular notice of this text, and says " The 6th verse " refers not, I apprehend, to Christ being *real* and " *essential* God, or JEHOVAH, (though *that* HE IS " so, *is the foundation of Christianity*), but to his " *glorious appearances*, as God, before and under " the Mosaic dispensation." The latter clause of the verse, he reads, " *to be as God.*" And that *as*, is the true reading of the word *ισα*, rendered *equal*, he refers to the LXX *, and quotes several passages from the Greek classics, where the word *ισα* is rendered *as*. Dr Whitby, who is also a strong favourer of the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity, and likewise Dr Doddridge, do both agree that the word rendered *equal*, should be *as*. Now, if the text should be read thus, " Who being in the form of God, " thought it no robbery to be as God." It falls short even in appearance, of being a proof of equality ; for since the Father judgeth no one, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, and delivered all things into his hand, in a more full measure, and permanent manner,

* The following are instances from the LXX. Job v. 14. " They grope at noon-day (*ισα*) as in the night." Job. x. 10. " Hast thou not curdled me (*ισα*) as cheese." Job. xi. 12. " Man is born (*ισα*) like a wild ass's colt." Job. xiii. 12. " Your remembrance is (*ισα*) like unto ashes. Ver 20. He consumeth (*ισα*) as a bottle." Job. xv. 16. " Man drinketh iniquity (*ισα* ποτω) as, &c." Job. xxiv. 20. " Wickedness shall be broken (*ισα*) as a tree." Job. xxvii. 16. " He prepareth raiment (*ισα*) as clay." Job. xxviii. 2. " Brass is molten (*ισα*) as a stone." Job. xxix. 14. " I put on judgment (*ισα*) as a robe." Job. xl. 15. " He eateth grass (*ισα*) as an ox." Isa. li. 23. " Thou hast laid thy body (*ισα*) as the ground." More instances might be quoted, but these are sufficient to shew that it is no forced translation to read *ισα*, *as*. Philip. ii. 6.

manner, than Pharaoh committed the administration of the affairs of Egypt to Joseph : May it not be said that the Son is as God, though he be not equal with God the Father, as well as it was said to Joseph thou art even as Pharaoh, though he was not equal with him ? The comparison is infinitely disproportionate, but earthly things sometimes serve to illustrate heavenly.

Though the above reading appears to be better than that which we have in the English translation, yet it does not correspond with the scope of the Apostle's reasoning in this place, which is to recommend humility, and a disinterested regard to the good of others. *Verse 3.* " Let nothing be done " through strife and vain-glory ; but in lowliness of " mind, let each esteem others better than them- " selves. *Verse 4.* Look not every man on his own " things, but every man also on the things of others. " *Verse 5.* Let this mind be in you which was also " in Christ Jesus." Lowliness of mind is first recommended, then a looking to the good of others ; and Christ is proposed as an example in these things. But how unsuitable is the example, if the words be, *who thought it no robbery to be equal with God, or even as God.* If the Apostle had exhorted them to the very reverse of what he does, it might have suited very well ; that is, had he said, *be ye high minded, and let each of you esteem himself equal with the highest,* then he might have added with propriety, *let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus ; who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God.* But this reading is also inconsistent with what immediately follows ; *but made himself of no reputation, or emptied himself, &c.* Now, allowing that Christ is here said to be equal with God the Father, could he in that capacity be emptied, suffer and die ? There is no transition to any other person or substance ; the very same individual being, spoken of in the 6th verse, is spoken of in those that follow. This reading being therefore pressed with such difficulties, and involved in such inconsistencies before and behind, it certainly deserves to be considered,

dered, whether or not the words might admit of a reading more consistent. There seems to be some difficulty among interpreters about the precise meaning of the word *απαρτημον*, rendered *robbery*. Dr Whitby is at some pains to shew, that it signifies a thing that is desirable. It is plain that it is from *απαρτω*, a verb which signifies *to snatch*, or *seize*, as a wild beast doth its prey; and it is also plain, that what is so seized, appears desirable, or excites desire in what seizes it. Though at first view this word may seem harsh or improper, yet upon a maturer consideration, it may appear to be a most proper and well-chosen word. The name *Θεός*, *Theos*, GOD, as has been noticed, signifies one who has a right and power to dispose and regulate persons and things, either in a supreme or subordinate sense. And *to be as God*, even *the most high God*, seems to have been the constant ambition of aspiring mortals; and in them it is a robbery most wicked and sacrilegious. What is said of the Babylonian monarch, and the prince of Tyrus, seems applicable to the generality of the kings of the earth, Isa. xiv. 13. *Thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; Verse 14. I will ascend above the height of the clouds, I will be like the Most High.* Universal monarchy, and uncontrolled despotism, seems to have been the general aim of every one of them, who have had the means of attempting it; and the most deceitful, cruel, and unjust means, have been made use of, to obtain the desired object. *To be as God*, may then with propriety, be called the desired thing, or even robbery, it being so universally and constantly usurped by the kings of the earth. But very different was the mind of Christ, *who being in the form of God, esteemed not for himself that desired thing to be as God.* Selfish views, such as honour and profit, make men seek after a power to dispose of the persons and goods of others; every man is a poor indigent being by himself, and the greatest monarch that ever caused terror in the land of the living, derived all his power,

the grandeur of his person, and the splendour of his court, from those that he had brought under him. But Christ the true and universal king, receives not honour from men; the disposing power, or universal administration that he is possessed of, is for the good of those over whom he exercises it, not his own; for he is altogether independent on creatures. The disposing power that he exercised as God, being therefore not on his own account, but on the account of those delivered into his hand, he esteemed it not for himself, but was ready to divest himself of all its glory, whenever his doing so was necessary to effect their good. It may also be observed, that the word rendered *he thought*, in the English translation, is in what is called the middle voice, which denotes the doing of a thing to or for one's self. The words of the text are, and I apprehend may be translated as follows. Philip. ii. 6. *ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπαρχων, ἐχ' ἁρπαγμον ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ὡς Θεὸς*. "Who
 " being in the form of God, he esteemed not for
 " himself, the coveted thing, to be as God." Let
 us try then how this reading agrees with the context. "Let nothing be done through strife or vain
 " glory, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem o-
 " ther better than themselves; look not every man
 " on his own things, but every man also on the
 " things of others. Let this mind be in you which
 " was also in Christ Jesus; who being in the form
 " of God, esteemed not for himself, that coveted
 " thing, to be as God; but made himself of no re-
 " putation, &c." According to this reading, the
 mind which is here said to be in Christ, is a most
 proper pattern for believers; for if he who was in
 the form of God, or appeared in the most glorious
 forms, invested with absolute and uncontrollable
 power over all created nature, having the disposal
 and management of all things in his hand, esteemed
 not the glory of these for himself, or did not esteem
 his thus being as God on his own account, so as not
 to lay aside all these glorious forms when it was sub-
 servient to the good of those committed to his ma-
 nagement;

nagement ; but emptied himself, &c. Then surely, those who profess to be his followers ought not to esteem for themselves the honours or profits they may enjoy, so as not to part with them when their doing so may be subservient to the general good ; but to forego all these for his name's sake whenever the case may require it. The *particle* BUT also, in the beginning of the 7th verse, concurs to confirm the reading here proposed. Instances too numerous to be quoted might be produced, to shew that when this *particle* is put before a positive proposition, the foregoing, with which it is connected, is negative ; the two instances in the context will, I think, be sufficient to illustrate this. " Do nothing through strife " and vain glory ; BUT in lowliness of mind, &c. " Look not every man to his own things ; BUT " every man also to the things of others." Can any thing then be more agreeable to sense, and the Apostle's manner of expression, in the context, than this ; " He esteemed not for himself the desired or " coveted thing to be as God ; BUT emptied himself, " self, &c." This text appears therefore to afford no support to the doctrine of equality, in any sense that it will bear ; and what appears to be the true literal reading, seems directly to contradict it in the plainest terms.

2. It is alledged by some, that because it is said, Isa. xlv. 24. " I am the Lord that maketh all things, " that stretcheth forth the heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself." Therefore there is a plurality of persons in JEHOVAH.

An unbiassed reader of the Scriptures would be ready to think, that it would require a strong prepossession to that opinion, before any one could imagine that this text affords any foundation for such an argument. Those who argue thus, might however be asked, What idea they have of this JEHOVAH? If they consider him as an individual, they cannot, in a consistency with common sense, consider him in the same respect as a plurality. Or if they consider him as plural, they cannot in the same respect consider him as one. How then is the argu-

ment formed? They will likely say, that JEHOVAH denotes the essence, in which there are three persons; the plain and unavoidable consequence of which seems to be, that when they speak of JEHOVAH as acting alone and by himself, they must have an idea of a person distinct from the Father, Son, and Spirit; or else they must suppose that the essence most commonly speaks and acts without personality. Their plan necessarily leads to abstract essence from persons, and persons from essence, by turns; the absurdity of which has been sufficiently insisted on already. But it may be asked further, Where they find a Mediator between this JEHOVAH and mankind sinners? Or how is this JEHOVAH to be worshipped through a Mediator? For instance, should they pray to JEHOVAH, they must surely, upon their plan, pray to him as one individual Being, including the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; where then will they find a Mediator? They will likely exclude the human nature from the idea of JEHOVAH, and view that as the Mediator; and indeed it is all that can stand in the relation of a Mediator according to their plan: And in that case they make the Mediator less than a human person; for they deny that the human nature of Christ is a person considered by itself, and yet they can have an idea of no more for the Mediator, unless they can have an idea of the divine Being as divided, or mediating betwixt sinners and himself.

There is no difficulty in the text, when we receive the Scripture account of the Father and the Son; for from thence we may learn (as has been noticed) that the name JEHOVAH is applicable both to the Father and the Son distinctly considered, and that any one of them may be said to make all things stretch out the heavens, and spread abroad the earth, *alone*, as to the manner in which their distinct agencies are exerted. For instance, when it is said of the Father, that he created all things by Jesus Christ, none else can be considered as a co-worker or co-partner in this; for he alone, and none else besides him, can be said to have created all things by Jesus Christ.

Christ. A consideration of this, with what was formerly observed relative to the distinct agencies of the Father and the Son, may sufficiently account for this expression in the text, here proposed as an objection, and all others of the same kind.

3. Heb. vi. 13. is by some alledged as a proof of equality, where it is said, "For when God could swear by no greater, he swore by himself."

This text can be no proof of equality, unless it can be proved, that it is the Son who speaks, considered as distinct from the Father. This, so far as I know, has never been so much as attempted; and it would be an attempt that I believe never will succeed. The Father surely says some things that are revealed in Scripture; or rather the generality of what is revealed in Scripture is spoken by him; for he who in times past spake by the prophets, did in the last of those days speak by his Son. Therefore what he speaks, though it be by the mediation of another, it is nevertheless his speech. Psal. cx. 1. is certainly the language of the Father, where it is said, "JEHOVAH said to my Lord, sit thou on my right hand." And it is certainly the Father who swears concerning the Son, *verse* 4. "Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedec." And I think no good reason can be given, why we are not to understand the Father to be meant in this text, Heb. vi. 13.

4. Zech. xiii. 7. "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow," &c. has also been brought as a proof of equality. From this it is argued, he that is God's fellow, must be his equal.

It might be a sufficient answer to this, only to observe, that by the same mode of arguing believers may be proved to be equal with the Son, and consequently equal with the Father. For concerning the Son it is said, Psal. xlv. 7. "Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." The argument for e-

quality appears equally as clear and conclusive from this, as from the other ; and the absurdities that would follow upon either, forbid the admission of both. If the person called God's fellow, be the same being or essence with the Father, then the same being or essence smites itself. But this is too absurd to be insisted on.

C O N C L U S I O N.

IT may be hoped, that from a view of the whole, every impartial reader, who seriously enquires, and in singleness of heart resolves, to determine by Scripture evidence, will be fully satisfied, that the doctrine here contended for, is every way scriptural and consistent ; whereas that which is opposed to it, is quite unscriptural, and self-contradictory.

As the testimony of God in his own word, is that which alone should determine our judgment, and be the alone foundation of our faith relative to divine things ; the opinions of men ancient or modern, must be of small consequence in this matter. Therefore, instead of quoting the testimonies of men, which at best may be doubted ; a few testimonies may be quoted from the sacred records, which are undoubtedly true, and which are allowed to be decisive, however little their decisions are submitted to.

1. We have a prophetic declaration concerning the Son of God, Isa. xi. 1,—4. “ And there shall
“ come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a
“ branch shall grow out of his roots. And the Spirit of JEHOVAH shall rest upon him, the Spirit of
“ knowledge and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and of might, the Spirit of wisdom and the
“ fear of the Lord. And shall make him of quick
“ understanding in the fear of the Lord ; and he
“ shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of his ears. But with
“ righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove
“ with equity for the meek of the earth, and he shall
“ smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and
“ with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.”

2. We have the Father's testimony concerning the

the Son, Isa. xlii. 1,—4. “ Behold my Servant
 “ whom I uphold, mine Elect in whom my soul
 “ delighteth, I have put my Spirit upon him, he
 “ shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall
 “ not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment
 “ in the earth ; and the isles shall wait for his law.”

3. We have the Son’s testimony concerning himself, Isa. l. 3, 4. “ I clothe the heavens with black-
 “ nefs, and I make sackcloth their covering. The
 “ Lord God hath given me the tongue of the learn-
 “ ed, &c.” And Psal. xl. 8. “ I delight to do thy
 “ will O my God.”

4. The Psalmist testifies the same when he ad-
 dresses the Son by the high characters of God and
 King, Psal. xlv. 6, 7. “ Thy throne, O God, is for
 “ ever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the
 “ sceptre of thy kingdom ; thou lovest righteousness
 “ and hatest wickedness ; therefore, God, even thy
 “ God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness
 “ above thy fellows.”

5. We have the testimony of John the Baptist,
 John i. 15,—18. “ John bare witness of him, and
 “ cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake ; he
 “ that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for
 “ he was before me. And of his fulness have all
 “ we received, and grace for grace. No man hath
 “ seen God at any time ; the only begotten Son,
 “ which is in the bosom of the Father he hath de-
 “ clared him.” And again, chap. iii. 32,—36.
 “ What he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth ;
 “ and no man receiveth his testimony. He that re-
 “ ceiveth his testimony hath set to his seal that God
 “ is true. For he whom God hath sent, speaketh
 “ the words of God ; for God giveth not the spirit
 “ by measure unto him. For the Father loveth the
 “ Son, and hath given all things into his hand. He
 “ that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life ;
 “ and he that believeth not the Son shall not see
 “ life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.”

6. We have the testimony of the Apostle Peter
 concerning the Son of God, which he testified to
 the

the Israelites in the audience of devout men from many nations, who all heard in their own language, at the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 22,—36. “ Ye men
 “ of Israel, hear these words ; Jesus of Nazareth, a
 “ man approved of God among you, by miracles and
 “ wonders and signs which God did by him in the
 “ midst of you ; as ye yourselves also know. This
 “ Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all wit-
 “ nesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of
 “ God exalted, and having received of the Father
 “ the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed abroad
 “ this which you now see and hear. Therefore let
 “ all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God
 “ hath made that same Jesus whom ye crucified,
 “ both Lord and Christ ”

We have also his testimony to the Gentiles who were assembled in the house of Cornelius, Acts x. 36, 38. 42. “ The word which God sent unto the
 “ children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ,
 “ he is Lord of all. How God anointed Jesus of
 “ Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power ;
 “ who went about doing good, and healing all that
 “ were oppressed of the devil, for God was with
 “ him. And he commanded us to preach unto the
 “ people, and to testify that this is he who was ordain-
 “ ed of God to be the Judge of the quick and dead.”

7. We have the testimony of the Apostle Paul, Col. i. 15, 16. “ Who is the image of the invisible
 “ God, the first born of every creature ; for by him
 “ were all things created that are in heaven, and
 “ that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they
 “ be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers ;
 “ all things were created by him and for him.”

More might be added to the same purpose, but these may afford sufficient evidence, for every impartial enquirer to believe, that though the Son of God is the great Creator, Preserver, and Governor of all things ; and though his capacities, glory and power, be altogether incomprehensible to the capacities of men ; yet there is still one who is greater than he, being his God and Father, and from whom he received

ceived all things. For, Isa. i. 1,—4. shews, that he was capable of receiving the Spirit of JEHOVAH, and that thereby he was made of quick discernment; Isa. xlii. 1,—4. that the Father upheld him; and Isa. l. 4. that he received from him the tongue of the learned.

Psal. xl. 8. and xlv. 6, 7. shew, that though the only begotten Son of God, be a God and King, even God over all created nature; yet the Father is his God, and hath anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows.

John i. 15,—18. and iii. 32,—36. shew, that all have received of the fulness of the only begotten of the Father, who being in the bosom of the Father hath declared him; that he testified what he had heard and seen; and that God had sent him; that he spake the words of God, and that the Father had loved him, and given all things into his hand.

Acts ii. 22,—36. and x. 36,—42. shew, that Jesus of Nazareth was approved of God, by the miracles, wonders, and signs, which God did by him; that God raised him, exalted him, and made him both Lord and Christ; that he is Lord of all; and that God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power, and ordained him to be the Judge of the quick and dead.

And Col. i. 15. shews, that Jesus Christ is the image of the invisible God, and also the first born of every creature.

Let us now hear what our Lord himself testified in the days of his flesh, concerning his doctrine, his authority and power, and concerning his own person.

Concerning his doctrine, he says, John vii. 16, 17.

“ My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me;
 “ if any man will do his will, he shall know of the
 “ doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I
 “ speak of myself.” John viii. 38. “ I do nothing
 “ of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I
 “ speak these things. *Verse* 40. But now, ye seek
 “ to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth
 “ which I have heard of God.” John xiv. 24.
 “ And the word which you hear is not mine, but
 “ the Father’s who hath sent me.” John xvii. 8.

“ For

"For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me."

Concerning his authority, he says, Matth. xxviii. 18. "All authority in heaven and earth is given unto me of my Father." John v. 22,—27. "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man."

Concerning his power or ability, he says, John v. 19,—30. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself. I can of mine own self do nothing."

Concerning his person, he says, John xiii. 3. "That he had come from God, and went to God." John xvii. 8. "And they have known surely that I came out from thee, and believed that thou didst send me." John iii. 16. "God so loved the world, that he sent his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John xvi. 28. "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go unto the Father." John xiv. 28. "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father; for my Father is greater than I."

With respect to his will he also declares, John v. 30. "I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." John vi. 38. "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."

These sayings of him who is the way, the truth, and the life; do clearly prove, that though his greatness exceeds the comprehension of creatures; yet the Father is greater than he. This indeed he expressly affirms, as well as that all that he hath is from the Father; whom it hath pleased that in him all fulness should dwell; and whom it hath pleased also, that the Son should subsist in the most intimate union with himself; even an ineffable union, by which his boundless capacities might be filled with the boundless

less perfections of the invisible Father ; behold his glory in an immediate manner, be satisfied with his goodness, and enraptured with his love. And that he should manifest these perfections and glory, communicate that goodness to created beings, and shed abroad his love into their hearts.

Human thought is lost in contemplating this mighty Saviour, who with special propriety is called *Wonderful* ; who can receive and enjoy an infinitely glorious object, as his chief good ; and yet extend his regard to the minutest creature that is ; for the earth is full of his goodness, and his tender mercies are over all his works.

In his person is presented to us a true and proper Mediator, a medium of intercourse and communication between infinite and finite nature. Through him the self-existing, invisible and immutable JEHOVAH, descends, as it were, to the works of his hands. And thro' him dependent mutable creatures, are raised and exalted to a participation of the divine fulness.

The Scriptures do in many places most beautifully represent the Lord Jesus Christ in this his mediatory character, as the medium through whom divine goodness descends to creatures, and through whom they ascend to the enjoyment of an infinite good ; thus it is said, John xvii. 22, 23. " The glory which thou gavest me, I have given them ; that they may be one, even as we are one. I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one. *Verse* 18. As thou has sent me into the world ; even so have I also sent them into the world." John vi. 57. " As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father ; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." 1 Cor. xi. 3. " The head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God." 1 Cor. iii. 23. " Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

Thus all things are of God who is reconciling sinners unto himself by Jesus Christ ; as we are expressly taught, " That to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things ; and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things, and we by him," 1 Cor. viii. 6. Agreeable to this also we
are

are taught, "That God the Father created all things
 "by Jesus Christ," Eph. iii. 9. "That by him he
 "brought the Israelites out of Egypt," Acts vii. 35.
 "That by him he spake to the people in the last
 "days of the Mosaic dispensation," Heb. i. 1.
 "That by him he did miracles, wonders and signs
 "to confirm the doctrine he gave him to teach,"
 Acts ii. 22. "That by him he is reconciling sinners un-
 "to himself," 1 Cor. iii. 23, 24. "And that by him he
 "will judge the world in righteousness," Acts xvii. 31.

How wonderfully does the love of God to man-
 kind appear, in the revelation he hath made of him-
 self through Jesus Christ? His loving-kindness and
 tender mercy that shines through the whole of that
 revelation he hath given, and the providences he exer-
 cises, appears conspicuous in this, among other par-
 ticulars: "That as it is life eternal to know the
 "only true God and Jesus Christ whom he hath
 "sent," John xvii. 3. "And grace and peace is
 "multiplied through the knowledge of God, and of
 "Jesus Christ our Lord;" 2 Pet. i. 2. so he hath
 afforded sufficient information for attaining this know-
 ledge; and it is a duty, as well as a privilege, "to
 "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord
 "and Saviour Jesus Christ," 2 Pet. iii. 18. "Whom
 "the Father hath appointed heir of all things, and by
 "whom also he constituted (*τὸν αἰῶνα*;) the ages,"
 Heb. i. 2.

Therefore let all who truly love God, and Jesus
 Christ his only begotten Son, unite their prayers and
 endeavours, to promote this important knowledge,
 for the subjecting and reconciling of all things unto
 him, according to that gracious purpose which he
 purposed in himself, "That in the dispensation of
 "the fulness of the times, he might gather toge-
 "ther into one, all things in Christ," Eph. i. 9, 10.
 "And that in his name every knee may bow, and
 "every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord,
 "to the glory of God the Father," Philip. ii. 10, 11.



E R R A T A.

Page.	Line.	For	Read
34	13	συνεργος - -	συνεργος
42	23	eccleastic - -	ecclesiastic
59	9	reafons - -	reason
87	25	quick - -	quick and dead
93	16	ame - -	fame
96	31	is it than - -	is it that
101	19	which - -	to which
106	28	disproportions - -	disproportion
115	6	הארע - -	הארצ
124	35	that - -	their
138	27	ordinance - -	ordinances
139	11	but also - -	but also says

These and what other typographical errors may have escaped, it is hoped the judicious and candid Reader will correct and excuse.



0.

